THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

ary

PARL. PAPERS

OR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616916

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_november-10-23-1908_196

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

8 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXCVI.

COMPRISING PERIOD FROM TUESDAY, TENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1908, TO MONDAY, TWENTY-THIRD OF NOVEMBER, 1908.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1908.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols. Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41	GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42	GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	...44	GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	...45	—	 1805
— 6 & 7	...46	—	 1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	...47	GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	...48	GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	...49	—	 1809
— 15 — 17	...50	—	 1810
— 18 — 20	...51	—	... 1810-11
— 21 — 23	...52	—	 1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	...53	GEO. III.	... 1812-13
— 27 & 28	...54	—	... 1813-14
— 29 to 31	...55	—	... 1814-15
— 32 — 34	...56	—	 1816
— 35 & 36	...57	—	 1817
— 37 — 38	...58	—	 1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	...59	GEO. III.	 1819
— 41	60	—	... 1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	... 1	GEO. IV.	 1820
— 4 & 5	... 2	—	 1821
— 6 — 7	... 3	—	 1822
— 8 — 9	... 4	—	 1823
— 10 — 11	... 5	—	 1824
— 12 — 13	... 6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	... 7	—	 1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	 7	GEO. IV.	 1826
— 17	 8	—	 1827
— 18 & 19	... 9	—	 1828
— 20 — 21	...10	—	 1829
— 22 to 25	...11	—	 1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Will. IV	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
—	9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
—	21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
—	31 — 35	7	—	1836
—	36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
—	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(Twenty-Eighth Parliament.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	Edward VII.	1906
—	169 to 182	7	,, ,,	1907
—	183 to 195	8	,, ,,	1908

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

MR. ASQUITH'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION
APRIL 1908.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. Viscount Wolverhampton.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
  Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
  Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
  War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
  India Office——Rt. Hon. Lord Morley.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Lord Fitzmaurice.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——T. McKinnon Wood, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Rt. Hon. Herbert Samuel, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Colonel Seely, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Lord Lucas.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——C. P. Trevelyan, Esq. M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Sir Hudson Kearley, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——C. F. G. Masterman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——F. D. Acland, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
  J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
  Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
  Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
  J. H. Whitley, Esq., M.P.
  J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
  Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
  Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
  Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
  General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
  General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
  Major-General C. F. Haddon (Master-General of the Ordnance)
  The Under Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. Russell, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir S. T. Evans, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt Hon. Earl Beauchamp.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of Elibank M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir Edward Strachey, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount Althorp.
Vice-Chamberlain——J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of Granard.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of Manchester.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl Granville.
- Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.
- Lord Acton.
- Lord Colebrooke.
- Lord Suffield.
- Lord Herschell.
- Lord Farquhar.

Judge Advocate-General——T. Milvain, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. John Sinclair
Lord High Constable——Earl of Errol.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of Breadalbane, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of Argyll, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord Kinnaird.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord Dunedin.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Solicitor-General——Alexander Ure, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir Stair Agnew, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. Leach, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of Aberdeen, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Lord Macdonnell, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord Herschell and Walter Callan, Esq
State Steward and Chamberlain——Sir Anthony Weldon, D.S.O.
Controller——Lord Pirrie.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice Walker.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Redmond Barry, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord Grenfell, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, P.C.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq., K.C.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. St. John, Esq. ; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; G. D. Luard, Esq. ; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. Ambrey Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright, A. J. Vaughan.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stoll.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir H. F. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M V O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Assistant Shorthand Writer——William Gurney Angus, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Chairman of Ways and Means——Rt. Hon. A. Emmott, M.P.
Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq., C.B.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Junior Clerks——W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour ; R. N. Bailey, Esq. ; G. F. M. Campion, Esq. ; S. de la Poer Beresford, Esq. ; H. S. Green, Esq. ; O. C. Williams Esq. ; V. W. D. Fox, Esq. ; E. F. Wise, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——ERNEST MOON, Esq., K.C.
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——V. KITTO, Esq ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART ; Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN and P. J. STOWELL.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURRY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT, Mr. R. TURTLE.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON, A. NEW.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXCVI.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

HOUSE OF LORDS, TUESDAY, 10TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

Page

OLD-AGE PENSIONS ACT, 1908.—His Majesty's Answer to the Address of 29th October last, delivered by the Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*), and read ... 1

The Lord Chancellor informed the House that he had received from the Registrar in Bankruptcy of the High Court of Justice, a certificate under the seal of the said Court, stating that the right hon. John Baron Dormer, of 8, Queensberry Place, Queen's Gate, in the county of London, being a Peer of the Realm, was adjudicated bankrupt on the 13th day of July, 1908. The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kirkcaldy and Dysart Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 2

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education.—Report of the Committee of Re-arrangement (Victoria and Albert Museum, Art Division) 2

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—No. 4,162. Persia (Khorasan) ... ...

Colonies.—Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates; statistical tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates 2

Aliens Act, 1905.—Return of alien passenger traffic between the United Kingdom and ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 30th September, 1908; together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom 3

Industrial Diseases.—Supplementary Report of the Departmental Committee on compensation for industrial diseases. Report, Minutes of evidence, and appendix 3

Royal University of Ireland.—Annual Report for the year 1907. Presented and ordered to lie on the Table 3

Nov. 10.] *Page*

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7,586, relating to animals being carried on the s.s. "Minnesota." 3

Post Office (**Savings Bank**).—The Post Office Savings Bank Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1908 3

Winter Assizes (**Ireland**).—Four Orders in Council, for holding winter assizes in Ireland 3

Intermediate Education (**Ireland**).—Rule in substitution of Rule 14 of the Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland 3

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade, CXIII.—CXXVI. Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table ... 3

Local Authorities (**Admission of the Press**) **Bill.**—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Tuesday next 3

Nurses Registration Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

The Earl of Wemyss 4
Lord Kinnaird 5
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 5
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 9
Lord Ampthill 10
The Earl of Wemyss 16
The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 16

On Question, Bill read 3ª and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for resuming the debate on the Second Reading read, and discharged 18

DECK CARGOES.

Lord Muskerry 18

Moved, for a Return showing the number of vessels which have carried deck-cargoes from ports in the United Kingdom, and giving particulars of accidents which have arisen out of them during the past five winter seasons.—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 19

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MERCHANT SHIPS AND WAR INSTRUCTION.

Lord Muskerry 20
The Earl of Granard 21

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 10TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Enfranchisement of Women.—Petition for Legislation; to lie upon the Table 21

Page
Licensing Bill.—Three Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 21
Monastic and Conventual Institutions.—Petition for legislation; to lie upon the Table 21

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sentence for Stealing Fowls at Enfield 21
Foreign Speaking Crew of s.s. "Zeeland" 22
Beer Ingredients 23
Bonus Distributed under the Land Purchase Act 24
Advances under the Land Purchase Act 24
British Subjects in Egypt 25
Family Deported from Canada on Account of Poverty 25
Pay and Prospects of Assistant Clerk 25
Pay of Labourers and Gardeners Employed by Dublin Board of Works ... 25
Civil Service Superannuation 26
Unofficial Work by Ordnance Survey Staff 26
Taxation at Home and Abroad 26
County Councils and Excise Duties 27
Income Tax Payers 28
Prohibition of Hop Substitutes 28
Hop Industry... 29
Delay in Business at Rooskey Petty Sessions Court 31
Inquiry into Affray at Riverstown 32
Pay and Pensions of Royal Irish Constabulary 32
Suggested State Library in Dublin 32
Irish Land Legislation 33
Payment of Irish Teachers' Fees 33
Relief of Irish Congested Districts 34
Army Horses from Wales 34
South African War Medal—Application from A. A. Reynolds 35

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

German Naval Programme 35
Dockyards and the Unemployed 35
Army Officers' Examination... 36
Officers' Quarters at the Curragh 36
Tropical Agriculture 37
Government Work in Ceylon 37
Colombo Graving Dock 37
French Tariff Commission Report 38
The Congo—Consul Thesiger's Report on the Kasai Region 38
Belgian Colonial Minister 38
Native Land Rights in the Congo 39
British Missions in the Congo 40
Forced Labour in the Congo 40

Nov. 10.] *Page*

Great Britain, Russia, and Persia ... 41
International Naval Conference ... 41
Fa-ku-men Railway ... 41
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill ... 42
Canadian Cattle Imports ... 42
Small Holdings in Gloucestershire ... 42
Emigration Statistics ... 43
Cyfartha Ironworks ... 43
Christmas Work at the Post Office ... 45
School Building Grant ... 45
Estate Duty Office Clerks ... 45
Estate Duty in Scotland ... 47
Old-Age Pensions ... 47
Investments in Colonial Securities ... 48
Beer Ingredients ... 49
Old-Age Pensions Administration ... 49
Old-Age Pensions in Ireland ... 50
Pensions Claims Delays ... 50
Petitions in favour of Woman Suffrage ... 51
Scottish Fishery Cruiser Contract ... 51
Douglas Estate, Longford ... 51
Cork Evicted Tenants ... 52
Irish Land Purchase ... 52
Templemary Estate, Cork ... 53
Irish Untenanted Lands ... 55
Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors ... 55
Infirmary Patients and Old-Age Pensions ... 56
Afforestation and Coast Erosions ... 56
Business of the House ... 57

Business of the House (Education (Scotland) Bill).—Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Education (Scotland) Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 189 ; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 363.) ... 58

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended (in the Standing Committee), read.

Mr. Boland (*Kerry, S.*) ... 59
Mr. J. MacVeagh (*Down, S.*) ... 64

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills in respect of Clause 15."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

* *Sir Henry Craik* (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) ... 66
The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) ... 71
Mr. William Redmond (*Clare, E.*) ... 75
Mr. Annan Bryce (*Inverness Burghs*) ... 81
Mr. James Hope (*Sheffield, Central*) ... 82
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) ... 85

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth) 87
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 88
Mr. Stewart (Greenock) 90
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) 91
Mr. Sinclair 93
Mr. Carlile (Herts., St. Albans) 95
Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.) 99

MR. SINCLAIR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 211; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 364.)

Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be re-committed to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bill in respect of Clause 15."

The House divided :—Ayes, 103; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 365.)

Bill, as amended, considered.

Mr. Sinclair 107

New clause—

"A committee on secondary education, or a school board having the management of an intermediate or secondary school, may, with the consent of, and subject to any conditions prescribed by, the Department establish, maintain, and manage or combine with another or other committees, school boards, or other bodies in establishing, maintaining, and managing a hostel or hostels for junior students, bursars, or other pupils attending intermediate or secondary schools. The scale of charges for residence and otherwise in connection with any such hostel shall from time to time be so adjusted as to defray as nearly as may be the expenditure in connection therewith not otherwise provided for, provided that a deficit occurring in any year, notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the Department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds. Any committee, school board, or other body as aforesaid may, with the consent of the Department, accept and hold any gifts of property for the purposes of this section." —(*Mr Sinclair.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Cochrane 108
Mr. Sinclair 110
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 111
Mr. Munro Fergusson (Leith Burghs) 111
Sir Henry Craik 113
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 114
Mr. Alexander Cross 115
Mr. Guiland (Dumfries Burghs) 116
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire N.W.) 116
Sir George McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 117
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 118
Mr. Molteno (Dumfriesshire) 119
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 120
Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) 121
Sir J. Dewar (Inverness) 122

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 211; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 366.)

Nov. 10.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 9, after the word 'defray,' to omit the words 'as nearly as may be.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Capt. Craig (Down, E.) ... 125
Mr. Sinclair ... 125

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved to the proposed new clause—

"In line 11, to omit the words 'provided that a deficit occurring in any year notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Mr. Gulland ... 126

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for a school board which makes special provision for the education of physically and mentally defective children to require the parents of such children to provide efficient education for such children up to the age of sixteen years."—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Sir Henry Craik ... 127
Mr. Sinclair ... 127
Mr. Carlile ... 128
Mr. Rainy (Kilmarnock Burghs) ... 129

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Mr. Munro-Ferguson ... 129
Sir Henry Craik ... 131

New clause—

"(1) The Secretary of Scotland may, at any time after the passing of this Act, by order, constitute school board districts as follows, and such districts shall hereafter be the districts for which school boards shall be elected, that is to say: (*a*) Each of the districts constituted, or to be constituted, in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889; (*b*) each of the counties not divided into Local Government districts; (*c*) each of the following districts, namely, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen. (2) Any question which may arise as to the county or local government district of which, for the purposes of this section, a burgh is to be deemed part shall be determined by the Secretary for Scotland, whose decision shall be final."—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) ... 138
Mr. H. Gooch (Camberwell, Peckham) ... 142
Mr. Lamont (Buteshire) ... 143
Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) ... 144
Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) ... 146

Page

Mr. R. Duncan 147
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson 148

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 29; Noes, 158. (Division List No. 367.)

Mr. Sinclair 151

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'institutions,' to insert the words 'within or.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Cochrane 151

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the word 'outwith,' and insert the words "within or without.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Sinclair 152

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, to leave out from the word 'supplied' to the end of the clause."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Cochrane 152

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 9, after the word 'debt,' to insert the words 'unless it is found that such parent or guardian was unable by reason of poverty or ill-health to supply sufficient and proper food or clothing for the child, or to give the child the necessary personal attention.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir F. Banbury 153
Sir Henry Craik 154
Mr. Cochrane 154
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 155
Mr. Sinclair 155
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 156
Mr. Barnes 156
Mr. Sinclair 156

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 1, to leave out the word 'found,' in order to insert the words 'shown to the satisfaction of the school board.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment to proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. James Hope 157

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 10, after the word 'parent,' to insert the words 'or guardian.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 157
Mr. Watt (Glasgow University) 157
Mr Mitchell-Thomson 157

Amendment negatived.

Nov. 10.] Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 11, after the word 'efficient,' to insert the word 'elementary.'"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'elementary' be there inserted."

Mr. Sinclair 160
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 161
Sir F. Banbury 162
Mr. James Hope 164

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 32; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 368.)

Clause 7 :

Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Owestry) 165
Sir Henry Craik 166

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out Clause 7"—(*Mr. Bridgeman*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'of,' in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 168
Sir William Anson 168
Mr Thomas Shaw 169
Mr. Munro-Ferguson 170
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 170
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 171
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 172
Sir F. Banbury 173

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 158; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 369.)

Mr. Munro Ferguson 177
Mr. Cochrane 177

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out the words 'or some person on his behalf.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 178

Amendment negatived.

Mr. James Hope 179
Captain Craig 179

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 29, to leave out Clause 8."—(*Mr James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the end of line 38, page 5, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 180
Mr. Cochrane 181
Mr. Thomas Shaw 182
Sir Philip Magnus 183
Sir William Anson 184
Mr. Sinclair 185
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 186

Question put.

Page

The House divided:—Ayes, 148; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 370.)

Mr. Bridgeman 187

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 39, to leave out the words 'after the age of fourteen years, and.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman*.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sinclair 189

Amendment negatived.

Sir F. Banbury 190

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 12, to leave out the words from the word 'shillings,' to end of subsection (3) of Clause 8, and insert the words 'and such procedure may be repeated against the same person, or in respect of the same offence, at intervals of not less than three months.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Thomas Shaw 191
Sir Henry Craik 191
Sir William Anson 191
Mr. Sinclair 192

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 13, after the word 'offence,' to insert the words 'whether relating to the same or to another young person.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. James Hope 193

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 14, to leave out the words 'or guardian.'"—(*Mr. J. F. Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir Philip Magnus 194

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 27, after the word 'practised,' to insert the words 'and the domestic arts.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Earl of Ronaldshay (Middlesex, Hornsey) 194

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, after the word 'physical,' to insert the words 'and in the case of male scholars military.'"—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Henry Craik 197
Mr. Haldane 199
Mr. Barnes 200

Mr. Ashley... 201
Mr. R. Duncan 202

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 27; Noes, 124. (Division List, No. 371.)
Captain Craig 205

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, at the end to insert the words 'and for the teaching of the National Anthem and the emblematic meaning of the national flag.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."
Mr. J. MacVeagh... 205

Amendment negatived.
Sir Henry Craik 207

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 3, to leave out subsection (3) of Clause 9."—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'seventeen,' in page 7, line 5, stand part of the Bill."
Sir Philip Magnus... 208
Mr. Sinclair 208
Mr. Younger (*Ayr Burghs*) 210
Mr. Cochrane 211
Mr. James Hope 211

Amendment negatived.
Mr. Sinclair 211

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, after the word 'offence,' to insert the words 'whether relating to the same or to another young person.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)
Sir A. Acland-Hood (*Somersetshire, Wellington*) 212

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be further considered this day.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

India (Trade).—Review of the trade of India in 1907–1908 213

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—No. 4164, France. No. 4165. Japan ... 213

Western Pacific.—Correspondence relating to the administration of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate 213

Dock Labour in Relation to Poor Law Relief.—Report by the Hon. Gerald Walsh.

Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 213

TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH.

Lord Heneage 213

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House British vessels should not be prohibited from trawling in waters outside the territorial limits of Scotland where foreign vessels are able to come in and use the fishing ground; and that any bye-laws now prohibiting British vessels from fishing in such waters should be withdrawn, and the open sea restored to the mutual condition in which it formerly existed under International law and the provisions of the North Sea Convention of 1882."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

Lord Eversley 220

The Marquess of Lansdowne 224

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 228

Amendment moved—

"That tho previous Question be put whether the said Question shall be now put."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Chancellor of the Duchy (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) 235
Lord Saltoun 240
The Earl of Erroll... 241
The Marquess of Salisbury 243
Lord Heneage 243
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 244

Amendment for putting the previous Question (by leave of the House) withdrawn; then the original Motion (by leave of the House) withdrawn.

THE DECORATION FOR NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS.

Lord Muskerry 244

The Earl of Granard 245

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow at half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table 246

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; to lie upon the Table.
Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 246

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Crimes (Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 320] 247

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4164 and 4165; to lie upon the Table 247

Nov. 11.]

Page

East India (Trade).—Review of the Trade of India for 1907–8; to lie upon the Table 247

Dock Labour in Relation to Poor Law Relief.—Report by the Honourable Gerald Walsh; to lie upon the Table 247

Western Pacific.—Correspondence relating to the Administration fo the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate; to lie upon the Table 247

Fiscal Policy of International Trade.—Copy ordered, "of Memorandum by Mr. Alfred Marshall on the Fiscal Policy of International Trade."

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 321.] 247

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Compensation for Licences Withdrawn 247
Scale of Living at Twickenham 248
Hours in Provincial Post Offices 248
Expedition of Mails to Ross, County Cavan 249
Women Inspectors of the Board of Education 249
1-Pounder Quick-Firing Guns 250
Appointment of Governor for the Island of Trinidad 250
Precautions against Anthrax 250
Baskets for Irish Postal Services 251
Registration of Ownership of Lands 251
The Crown and the Prerogative of Mercy... 252
Civil Service Supply Association 253
Pension Officer for Bryansford, County Down 253
Licence-Holders Brewing own Beer 254
Brewers Paying Duty on less than 500 Barrels 254
Home Produce of Hops 254
Old-Age Pensions Claims 255
Old-Age Pensions in Ireland 256
Old-Age Pensions in the Channel Islands 257
Indian Army—Ex-Sandhurst Cadets and Ex-Militia Officers 257
Dismissals of Labourers and Artisans from Cork Barracks 258
Provision of Second Uniform for Territorial Army 259
Stamp Duty on Share Options 259

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Protection of Life at Sea 259
Admiralty Contracts and Unemployment 260
Wages on Government Contracts at Portsmouth 261
Rosyth Contracts 261
Naval Base at Cromarty Firth 261
Admiralty Orders at Cowes 262
Docks for Dreadnoughts 262
Baroda Education System 263

Page

Imports of Spirits into Brass 263

Gold Coast—Railway Rates on Spirits 263

Fines in the Delta of the Niger 264

Gin as Currency 264

Imports of Specie into Brass 265

Brass Produce 265

Southern Nigeria—Sale of Spirits to Natives 265

Trinidad 266

Tropical Diseases 266

Venezuela and Trinidad 267

German Imposts on Alcoholic Liquors 268

Pensions Officers' Excessive Duties 268

Cumberland and the Licensing Grant 270

Supplementary Distress Grant 270

Marriage of Lunatics 271

Case of David Evans of Aberdare 271

s.s. "Taunton"—Disobedient Seamen 272

Imports of Ship Plates and Tram Rails 272

Railway Combines 275

American Copyright Act 275

International Copyright Conference 276

Canadian Trade Correspondents 276

Distress Works 277

Poor Relief for the Aged 278

Hackney Marshes—Proposed Model Yacht Lake 278

Mortlake Motor Fatality 279

Motor Speeds in Hyde Park 280

School Attendance Regulations 280

Scholars in Elementary Schools 281

Devonport Naval Engineering College 281

Edinburgh Relief Works 282

Aged Paupers in Scotland 283

Afforestation in Ireland 283

Irish Creamery Butter 284

Irish Surprise Butter Competitions 285

Cattle-Driving Prosecutions 285

Aged Paupers in Ireland 286

Longford Labourers' Cottages 286

Irish Old-Age Pension Appeals 287

Untenanted Lands—Landlords' Appeals 287

Royal Irish Constabulary 288

Irish Police Warning to Newspapers 290

Excluded Tenants 291

Cork County Prosperity 292

Irish Land Purchase 292

Nov. 11.]

Page
Templemore Bomb Outrage 294
Ballinacurra Drainage Scheme 294
County Clare Cattle-Drives 295
Ireland—Old-Age Pension Officers 296
Administration of Distress Funds 296
Tuberculosis Among Soldiers 296
Small Holdings—Intimidation by Landlords 297
Port of London Bill 298
The Public Galleries 298

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PORT OF LONDON BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Port of London Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 372) 300

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (LICENSING BILL) (ALLOCATION OF TIME ON REPORT STAGE).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 301

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the proceedings on each of the five allotted days given to the Report stage of the Licensing Bill shall be those shown in the second column of the following table, and those proceedings shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at the time shown in the third column of that table—

TABLE.

REPORT STAGE.

Allotted Day.	Proceedings.	Time for Proceedings to be brought to a Conclusion.
First - -	New Clauses and Clauses 1 and 2 - -	10.30
Second - -	Clauses 3 and 4 - - - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 5 to 9 - - - - - - -	10.30
Third - -	Clauses 10 to 17 - - - - - -	10.30
Fourth - -	Clauses 18 and 19 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 20 to 23 - - - - - -	10.30
Fifth - -	Clauses 24 to 35 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clause 36 to the end of the Bill, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion - - - -	10.30

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 307
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 313
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 317
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) 317
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorks, E.R., Holderness) 318
Mr. Asquith 320

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered accordingly.

Port of London (Recommitted) Bill.—Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) 321

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out from the word 'eighteen,' to end of subsection, and to insert the words 'nineteen. By payers of dues on ships trading to the docks, four; by payers of dues on ships trading to the river three; by traders, five; by waterside manufacturers, two; by wharfingers, three; by owners of river craft, two.'"—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The President of The Board of Trade (Mr. Churchill, Dundee) 328
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 329
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 332
Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central) 335
Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.) 337
Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn) 339
Mr. Russell Rea (Gloucester) 340
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 342
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 345
Sir William Bull (Hammersmith) 348
Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central)... 350
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 350
Mr. Bonar Law 352
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Sir H. Kearley, Devonport) 353
Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford) 355
Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton) 357

Amendment negatived.

Colonel Warde (Kent, Medway) 358

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the word 'ten,' and insert the word 'eleven.'"—(*Colonel Warde.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'ten' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 361
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 362
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 366
Mr. E. H. Lamb (Rochester) 369
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) 371
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 373
Mr. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn) 377
Mr. William Rutherford 378
Mr. Rowlands 381
Mr. W. Thorne (West Ham, S.) 385
Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) 387
Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.) 388
Mr. Bonar Law 393
Mr. Churchill 394
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 397
Mr. Radford (Islington, E.) 398

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176, Noes, 46. (Division List No. 373.)

Page

Mr. Holt (Northumberland, Hexham) 401

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'two,' and to insert the word 'three.'"—*(Mr. Holt.)*

Question proposed, 'That the word 'two' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 402
Sir Gilbert Parker 403

Amendment, by leave withdrawn.

Mr. E. H. Lamb 404
Mr. Carr-Gomm (Southwark, Rotherhithe) 406

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'and one of the members of the Port authority appointed by the London County Council shall be appointed by the Council after consultation with such organisations representative of labour as the Council think best qualified to advise them in the matter.'"—*(Mr. Carr-Gomm.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 407
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 408
Mr. Steadman 410
Mr. W. Benn (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) 412
Sir Gilbert Parker 414
Mr. Napier 415
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 415

Amendment agreed to—

Mr. Morton 416

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out subsection (9), and to insert the words '(9) The Port authority shall set apart such sum not exceeding in a year two thousand one hundred pounds, as the Port authority with the approval of the Board of Trade thinks fit, and shall divide the same among the members of the Port authority as they from time to time think fit."—*(Mr. Morton.)*

Question put, "That the words of the subsection down to 'vice-chairman,' in line 27, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 418
Sir A. Spicer 419
Sir H. Kearley 420
Mr. H. C. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 421
Mr. Morton 422

Amendment negatived—

Mr. Holt... 423

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, after the word 'Chairman,' to insert the word 'and.'"—*(Mr. Holt.)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 425
Mr. Bonar Law 426
Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 427
Mr. Barnard 427
Mr. Morton 428
Mr. Crooks... 428

Page

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Morton 429

Amendment, proposed—

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out subsection 11."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the subsection down to the word 'Board,' in line 35 stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 430
Mr. Morton 431

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2.

Mr. Morton 432

Motion made, and Question, proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Mr. Churchill 432
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*)... 432
Mr. Lloyd-George 434
Lord R. Cecil 434

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2 :

Mr. McArthur (*Liverpool, Kirkdale*) 435

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 20, at end, to insert the words '(*c*) acquire and carry on the undertaking of the Trinity House transferred to the Port authority by this Act.'"—(*Mr. McArthur,*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 438
Mr. Bonar Law 439
Mr. E. H. Lamb 439
Mr. William Rutherford 440
Mr. Owen Phillips (*Pembroke and Haverfordwest*) 441
Mr. Williamson 441
Mr E. H. Lamb 442

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 6; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 374.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 22, after the word 'jetties,' to insert the word 'locks.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'locks' be there inserted."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Question, "That Clause 3 be postponed until after the consideration of Clause 11," put, and agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :

Mr. Barnard 444

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'all property and liabilities of the conservators held, acquired or incurred

Page

in respect of the Thames below the landward limit of the Port of London.' "—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 445

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cave 445

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 42, at end, to insert the words '(*g*) So much of Section 160 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, as authorises a toll to be demanded or received in respect of any vessel navigating westward of Londen Bridge to or from any point eastward of Teddington Lock shall be repealed; and.' "—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.' "

Sir H. Kearley 447

Mr. Cave 448

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. William Rutherford 448

Mr. Churchill 449

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7:

Mr. Morrell (*Oxfordshire., Henley*) 449

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 40, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or any powers conferred upon them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public with respect to the Thames and its towpaths.' "—(*Mr. Morrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 453

Mr. Barnard 454

Mr. Morton 454

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lehmann (*Leicestershire, Market Harborough*) 455

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 40, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or by the council of any county, borough, district, or parish adjoining the Thames that the Conservators having failed to exercise any powers conferred on them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public in respect to the Thames and towing-paths which they ought to have exercised.' "

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 11 agreed to.

Committee report progress; to sit again To-morrow.

APPLICATION OF SINKING FUNDS IN EXERCISE OF BORROWING POWERS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to inquire and report as to the powers conferred on Local Authorities by Local Acts, Provisional Orders, Stock Regulations, or otherwise, of utilising

Page

for purposes for which such authorities have borrowing powers, sinking funds (including loans funds and redemption funds) set aside by them for the repayment or redemption of loans raised by the issue of stock or by any other method; as to the expediency or otherwise of such powers being conferred; and as to any conditions which it is desirable to attach to the granting or use of such powers.

Committee accordingly nominated of—Mr. Ashton, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Masterman, and Mr. Charles Nicholson.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*) 456

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.—Several witnesses ordered to attend the Committee for Privileges on Tuesday next, and produce documents 457

BARON KILMAINE.—Petition of John Edward Deane, Baron Kilmaine in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House... 457

The Marquess of Linlithgow sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 457

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Evictions (Ireland).—Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1908 457

Colonies: Annual.—No. 582. Straits Settlements; Report for 1907. Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 457

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post (Argentine Republic)).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 26) Warrant, 1908. Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 457

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], That the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] ought to be allowed to proceed: The said Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee) to be printed. [No. 223.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House; and to be printed as amended. [No. 224] 457

Children Bill.—Report of Amendments received.

The Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp) 458

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'parents,' to insert the words 'or having no parents.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 9 agreed to.

Nov. 12.]

Page

Lord Alverstone 458

Amendment moved—

"In page 10, line 8, after the word 'pounds,' to insert the words 'Provided that it shall be a sufficient defence to a charge under this section if the defendant proves that a person over seven years of age was left in charge of such child.'"—(*Lord Alverstone*)

Earl Beauchamp 459

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl Beauchamp 459

Amendment moved—

"In page 11, line 3, after the word 'girl,' to insert the words 'who has been seduced or become a prostitute.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

Lord Alverstone 459

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 18, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'that Court or any Court of like jurisdiction.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment to Clause 22 agreed to.

Consequential Amendment to Clause 23 agreed to.

The Earl of Meath 460

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 26, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'Provided that such persons shall be either inspectors or assistant inspectors of reformatory and industrial schools, members of the medical or nursing professions, or persons of discretion and of experience in the management and training of children.'"—(*The Earl of Meath.*)

Earl Beauchamp 462

The Marquess of Lansdowne 462

The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe.*) 463

Lord Alverstone 465

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'or nursing professions,' and to insert the words 'profession.'"(*Lord Heneage.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'of discretion and.'"—(*Earl Cromer.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, That the Amendment as amended be added to the clause.

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 60; Not-contents, 39.

Amendment moved—

"In page 23, line 32, to leave out the words 'Provided that,' and to insert the word 'and'; and in the same line to leave out the word 'not,' and in line 33, to leave out the word 'girl,' and to insert the word 'boy,' and after the word 'smoking' to insert the words 'but not a girl.'"—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Page

Drafting Amendments to Clauses 42 and 43 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 467

Amendment moved—

"In page 29, line 6, to leave out the words 'Court of Summary Jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Alverstone 468

Amendment moved—

"In page 30, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words 'other than the mother of the child.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

Earl Beauchamp 469
The Earl of Crewe 469
The Marquess of Lansdowne 470
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 470
The Earl of Halsbury 470
The Lord Bishop of Wakefield 471

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 471

Amendment moved—

"In page 30, line 22, after the word 'Court,' to insert the words 'of Assize or Quarter Sessions or a Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequental Amendment to Clause 58 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 472

Amendment moved—

"In page 32, line 30, to leave out from the word 'Court' to the end of the clause, and to insert the words 'the Court in addition to such order make an order under the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907, that the child or young person be placed under the supervision of a probation officer. Provided that the recognisance into which the child, if not charged with an offence, or the young person is required to enter, shall bind him to appear and submit to the further order of the Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequental Amendments to Clauses 66 and 67 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 473

Amendment moved—

"In page 36, line 41, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'Provided that this subsection shall not apply in any case where the child was ordered to be sent to an industrial school for the purpose only of enforcing an attendance order made in consequence of his parent, guardian, or other person legally liable, to maintain him neglecting to provide efficient elementary instruction for him.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp*).

Lord Kinnaird 473
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh 474

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp.

Nov. 12.] *Page*

Amendment moved—

"In page 38, line 28, after the word 'service,' to insert the words 'including service in the Navy or Army.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 72 agreed to.

Lord Stanley of Alderley 475

Amendment moved—

"In page 41, lines 13 to 18, to leave out subsection (2)."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Earl Beauchamp 479
The Earl of Donoughmore 480

On Question, Amendment negatived.

The Earl of Donoughmore 480

Amendment moved—

"In page 42, line 42, after the word 'provision,' to insert the words 'and in cases where it appears to the Secretary of State practicable and expedient the contract shall provide for the representation of the local authority on the governing body of the certified school.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Earl Beauchamp 481
Lord Stanley of Alderley 482
Earl of Crewe 482
The Earl of Donoughmore 483

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Consequential Amendment to Clause 75 agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 108 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 483

Amendment moved—

"In page 62, line 25, after the word 'county,' to insert the following new subsection: (12) The Local Government Board may by order transfer from the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the London County Council any buildings provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board for the purpose of remand homes under Section 4 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, together with any liabilities incurred by the Metropolitan Asylums Board in connection with such buildings, and on such transfer the buildings shall become places of detention for the purposes of this part of this Act, and the order may also provide for the transfer of any officers employed by the Metropolitan Asylums Board in connection with such remand homes, and for securing to such officers any rights as to pension or otherwise to which they may be entitled.—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 484

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 111, page 63, line 36, after the first 'and' to insert the words 'a Court of Summary Jurisdiction so sitting in this Act referred to as a juvenile Court.

"(2) Where in the course of any proceedings in a juvenile Court it appears to the Court that the person charged or to whom the proceedings relate is sixteen years or upwards, or where in the course of any proceedings in any Court of Summary Jurisdiction other than a

juvenile Court it appears that the person charged or to whom the proceedings relate is under the age of sixteen years, nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing the Court if it thinks it undesirable to adjourn the case from proceeding with the hearing and determination of the case.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Chancellor 484

Amendment proposed—

"After Clause 113, and at the beginning of Part VI., to insert the following new clause: 'where a woman is convicted of the murder of her infant, and that child was under the age of one year, the Court may, in lieu of passing a sentence of death, sentence her to penal servitude for life or any less punishment.' "—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Alverstone 485
The Lord Chancellor 486
The Earl of Halsbury 487
The Lord Bishop of Southwark 488
Lord Ashbourne 489
The Earl of Crewe 489
Lord Alverstone 490
Lord Coleridge 490

On Question, "That the new clause be there inserted."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 36; Non-contents, 42.

Earl Russell 491

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 118."—(*Earl Russell.*)

Earl Beauchamp 493
The Earl of Donoughmore 493
Lord Farrer 493
The Earl of Crewe 494
The Marquess of Salisbury... 494
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh... 495

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Earl Beauchamp 496

Amendment moved—

"In page 66, line 13, to leave out the words 'or nurse.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 496
The Earl of Crewe 497

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment in Clause 131 agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 497

Amendment moved—

"In page 73, line 27, after the word 'magistrate' to insert the words 'Provided further that a prosecution for an offence under Part I. or Part II. of this Act may be instituted by the inspector of poor or any other person authorised by the local authority.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Verbal Amendment agreed to.

Nov. 12.] *Page*

Amendment moved—

"In page 75, line 34, to page 76, line 15, to leave out subsection (21).'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 498
Lord Herschell 498

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 79, line 5, after the word 'order,' to insert the following new subsection: '(26) The immediately preceding subsection shall apply to the Aberdeen Reformatories and Industrial Schools Act, 1885, as if it were herein re-enacted with the omission of the portions thereof under the headings (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*), and with the substitution of the last-mentioned Act for the Glasgow Acts.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday, the 24th instant, and to be printed as amended. [No. 225.]

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP M).—Sir LUKE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group M. of Private Bills: That for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, 17th November, at Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 499

PETITIONS.

Enfranchisement of Women.—Two Petitions for legislation; to lie upon the Table 499

Importation of Plumage Prohibition Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table 499

Licensing Bill.—Three Petitions for alteration; to lie upon the Table. Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table... 500

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Evictions (Ireland).—Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1908; to lie upon the Table 500

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 26) Warrant, 1908; to lie upon the Table ... 500

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Overtime in the Dundee Post Office 500
Wages of Transferred Postmen 500
Admiralty Purchase of Greenock Foreshore 501

Page
Ventnor Telegraph Clerk's Grievance 501
Irish Postal Baskets 502
Ballyshannon Postal Service 502
Port of London 503
Irish University Commissioners 503
County Cavan Evicted Tenants 504
Cancer in Ireland 505
Notification of Infectious Diseases 506
Runcorn Vaccination Death 507
Babies and Tuberculosis Germs 507
Admiralty Timber Contracts 507
Small Holdings in Kent 508
Edenbridge Labourer's Grievance 508
Black Scab in Potatoes 510
Gooseberry Mildew 510
Crockham Hill Dairy Farm 512
Edinburgh Cooper's Conviction 512
Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief 513
Married Couples and Pensions 513
Aliens and Pensions 513
Highlanders and Pensions 513
Pension Committees' Accounts 514
Warwickshire Territorials 515
The Postmaster-General's Visit to Bradford—Call for the Military 515
Special Reserve and the Unemployed 516
Army Boot Contracts 516
Price of Army Boots 517
Cape of Good Hope Licence and Stamp Fees 517
Postage of English Trade Circulars Abroad 517
Police Ambulances in London 518
International Copyright Conference—British Delegates 518
Worcester Quarter Sessions—Shorthand Writers' Fees 519
Regents Park Lake 520
Chartered Company of Rhodesia 520

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Liquor Contracts 520
German Workmen on British Contracts 523
The Home Fleet 523
The Channel Fleet 523
Education in Bombay 525
His Majesty's Proclamation to India 526
Indian Reforms 526
Amnesty of Prisoners in India 527
The Maharajah of Burdwan 528

Nov. 12.]

Page

Transvaal Civil Service ... 528
Natal Native Administration ... 530
The Pacific Phosphate Company ... 530
British and Canadian Trade ... 532
Persian Constitution ... 534
Ex-Constable George Reed ... 534
Licensing Statistics ... 535
New Licences and Tied Houses ... 535
Lancashire Cotton Trade Disputes ... 535
Shipping Regulations ... 536
Birmingham Gun Trade ... 536
British Investments Abroad ... 537
Underground Railway Employees and Conciliation Boards ... 538
The Administration of the Distress Fund ... 539
Valuation of Corporate Property ... 540
West Ham Distress Committee ... 541
Housing and Town Planning Bill ... 541
Old-Age Pensions ... 541
Mombasa Mail Service ... 542
Postal Split Duties ... 542
Christmas Pay in the Post Office ... 543
London and Paris Mail Service ... 544
City Postmen's Duties ... 545
National Telephone Company ... 545
Postal Duties in Lincolnshire ... 546
Small Holdings in Gloucestershire ... 547
Clyde Pilot's Grievance ... 547
Kilmalig Rent Dispute ... 548
Castleconnell Burial Dispute ... 548
Killen United Irish League Branch ... 550
Lacken Moonlight Outrage ... 550
Crookenden and Casey Estate, Cavan ... 551
Cavan Evicted Tenants ... 551
Firearm Outrages in Ireland ... 551
United Irish League in County Sligo ... 552
Threatening Letters to Magistrates ... 552
Alleged Terrorism in Ireland ... 553
Drogheda Cattle-Drive ... 553
Elphin Agrarian Dispute ... 554
Macroom Explosion ... 554
Athenry Eviction ... 555
Ballybricken Fair Disturbance ... 555
Kenmare Sub-Land Commission Court ... 556
Clare Evicted Tenants ... 557
Limerick Borough Finance ... 557

Page

Sherlock Estate, Araglen, Cork 558
Leader Estate, County Cork 558
Irish Intermediate Education Rules 559
New Licences 559
Standard of Naval Strength 560
Agricultural Instructions in Elementary Schools 560
The Education Bill 561
The Port of London Bill 562

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Attorney-General.

Report to lie upon the Table 563

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [LORDS]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [LORDS]; Statute Law Revision Bill [LORDS].—Report from the Joint Committee in respect of the Post Office Consolidation Bill [LORDS], pending in the Lords, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 322.] ... 563

ADJOURNMENT.—(Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the important difference between the statement of the Prime Minister regarding the future administration of the Unemployed Workmen Act and the Order issued this day by the Local Government Board;" and the pleasure of the House being signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past Eight this evening 564

Business of the House (Port of London Bill).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Port of London Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House.")—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 228; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 375.) 564

Port of London (Recommitted) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 567
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Sir H. Kearley, Devonport) 583
Sir F. Dixon-Hartland (Middlesex, Uxbridge) 593
Mr. Russell Rea (Gloucester) 596
Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) 600
Mr. W. Pearce (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) 606
Mr. McLaren (Staffordshire, W.) 609
Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central) 612
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Churchill, Dundee) 619

Nov. 12.] Page

Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 626
Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central) 630
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 634

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the Clock, and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

UNEMPLOYMENT—THE ADMINISTRATION OF RELIEF GRANTS.

Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 640

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn." (*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.)... 643

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Port of London (Recommitted) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Postponed proceeding on the Question, "That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill"—resumed.

Mr. Morton 645
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 648
Sir William Bull (Hammersmith)... 649
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 651

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 180; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 376.)

Clause 12:

Mr. Renwick 653

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 3, to leave out the words 'or coastwise.'"—(*Mr. Renwick.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 657
Sir C. Cory (Cornwall, St. Ives) 657

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 7, after the word 'such,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 10, after the first word 'the' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Holt (Northumberland, Hexham) 658

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 15, to leave out Paragraph (*a*)."—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the word 'different' in line 16, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 659

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 16, after the word 'different' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 31, after the word 'maximum,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 37, after the word 'maximum,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 659

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that if at any time it is necessary to raise by means of such rates a larger sum than two hundred thousand pounds in any year, the port authority shall not be entitled to raise such larger sum except in such manner and from such sources as Parliament shall determine, and it shall be the duty of the port authority to apply to Parliament for the necessary powers accordingly.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 664
Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton) 665
Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.) 667
Mr. Churchill 667
Mr. Bonar Law 667
Mr. Churchill 668

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 2, at the end, to insert the words 'If in each of two successive years the aggregate amount received from the rates on goods exceeds one-thousandth part of the aggregate value of the goods imported into, and exported from, the Port of London in that year, it will be the duty of the Port authority to take the necessary steps to prevent the continuation of the excess, including, if necessary, an application to Parliament to provide any further means necessary to meet its financial obligations.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lough 669

Amendment to proposed Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, after the word 'goods,' to insert the words 'to and from parts beyond the sea.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 16, line 7, after the word 'such,' to insert the word 'port.'"

Nov. 12.] Page

"In page 16, line 10, after the first word 'the,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, subsection (4) to be omitted."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to 'them' in line 42, stand part of the clause."

Sir H. Kearley 671

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 17, line 5, after the second word 'of,' to insert the word 'port.'"

"In page 17, line 11, after the word 'any,' to insert the word 'port.'"

"In page 17, line 42, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to

Mr. Holt 672

Amendment proposed—

"In page 18, line 5, at the end, to add the words '(5) The Port authority on the one hand and any owner or master of or agent for any vessel in the coastwise or short sea trade to or from the Port of London, or any person or persons interested in goods, merchandise, or cargo carried by any such vessel on the other hand, may from time to time enter into and carry into effect, vary and rescind agreements or arrangements with respect to the mode of calculation or payment, or the time of payment, of rates payable to the Port authority in respect of all or any goods, merchandise, articles, or things forming the cargo, or part of the cargo, of any such vessel. Provided always, that in case the Port authority shall at any time make any such agreement the owner or master of or agent for any vessel engaged in like manner, or any person interested in goods, merchandise, or cargo carried by any such vessel, shall be entitled, the circumstances being the same, to require the Port authority to enter into a like agreement or arrangement with him or them upon the same terms, to the intent that no agreement shall be made by the Port authority under this provision partially or in favour of any particular person, vessel, or cargo.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 673

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question proposed, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Lough 673
Sir H. Kearley 674

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13, 14, and 15 agreed to.

Clause 16 :

Mr. Lough... 676

Amendment proposed—

"In page 19, line 11, to leave out from beginning of line to end of subsection."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 677

Amendment, by leave withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 17 :

Mr. Fell 677

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 1, at end, to insert the words 'constructing a lock or locks across the river bed.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 677
Mr. Fell 678

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 18 :

Mr. Lough 678

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 38, to leave out paragraph (*a*)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 679
Sir F. Banbury 679
Mr. Morton 680

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lough 680

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 18, to leave out subsection (5)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 681
Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, N.E.) 682
Mr. Holt 682
Mr. Churchill 682
Mr. Morton 682
Mr. Lough 683

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 19, 20, and 21 agreed to.

Clause 22 :

Mr. Lough 683

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 3, to leave out subsection (2)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Churchill 684
Mr. Radford (Islington, E.) 685
Mr. Morton 686

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 23:

Mr. Lough ... 686

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 28, at the end to insert the words 'Provided also that all receipts in respect of goods discharged or taken on board in the river shall be shown separately from the receipts from vessels which enter docks.' "—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 24 and 25 agreed to.

Clause 26:

Mr. Seaverns ... 687

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 4, after the word 'business,' to insert the words 'or of the charges made in respect thereof, whether levied directly or indirectly, and whether under the maximum or not.' "—(*Mr. Seaverns.*)

Questioned proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill ... 689

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 4, after the word 'business,' to insert the words 'including charges made in respect of such business.' "—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Churchill ... 690

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 14, to leave out from the word 'complaint' to the word 'to,' in line 15, and to insert the words 'is made on behalf of a trade or a section of a trade by the London Chamber of Commerce or any other representative association interested in the trade of the Port of London or relates.' "—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir A. Spicer ... 690
Mr. Lough ... 691
Mr. Seaverns ... 691
Mr. Churchill ... 691

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Edwin Cornwall (*Bethnal Green, N.E.*) ... 692
Mr. Churchill ... 692

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the words 'Port of London' to insert the words 'which obtains a certificate from the Board of Trade that it is a proper body to make such complaint.' "—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 28, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'as compared with the charges existing at the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 18, after the word 'fit,' to insert the words 'after giving any persons appearing to the Board of Trade to be interested an opportunity of being heard.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 27:

Mr. Carr-Gomm 693

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 33, after the word 'labour' to insert the words 'and that no such offices, waiting-rooms, or employment registers shall be established and maintained inside the area of the dock premises.'"—(*Mr. Carr-Gomm.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 693
The Postmaster-General (*Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) ... 693

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 38 agreed to.

Clause 39:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 32, line 14, at the end, to insert the words '(2) Sections fourteen and fifteen of the Harbours, Docks, and Piers Clauses Act, 1847 (which relate to the construction and maintenance of works for the accommodation of the officers of Customs), shall apply to the Port authority in respect of any new docks constructed by them in pursuance of the powers conferred by this Act, as if they were incorporated in this Act, and shall also, as from the appointed day, apply to the Port authority in respect of all docks transferred to the Port authority by this Act, which were constructed in pursuance of any special Act with which those sections are not incorporated: (*a*) As if those sections had been so incorporated; and (*b*) as if any watch-houses, boat-houses, huts, or weighing materials provided before the appointed day at those docks by any predecessors of the Port authority for the accommodation of those officers had been provided in pursuance of the obligation imposed by those sections. Provided that nothing in this provision shall prejudice or affect any right, or authority, or liability of the Commissioners of Customs, or the Commissioners of Works, under any agreement relating to any such watch-house, boat-house, hut, or weighing materials made before the passing of this Act between the Commissioners of Customs, or the Commissioners of Works, and any predecessors of the Port authority.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 40 and 41 agreed to.

Nov. 12.] *Page*

Clause 42 :

Mr. Churchill 695

Amendments proposed—

"In page 33, line 1, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'any property of any Government Department or.'"

"In page 33, line 4, after the word 'of' to insert the words 'the department or.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. E. H. Lamb 695

Amendment proposed—

"In page 33, line 8, after the word 'or' to insert the words 'Essex, Kent.'"—(*Mr. E. H. Lamb.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 695

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 43 to 46 agreed to.

Clause 47 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 35, line 35, after the word 'tonnage,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 48 and 49 agreed to.

Clause 50 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 36, line 27, to leave out the word 'and,' and to insert the words 'but there shall be no adjustment of or concerning capital expenditure incurred prior to the appointed day below the city stone at Staines Bridge, nor with respect to the officers of the Conservancy, on the Victoria Embankment, in the County of London, or the superannuation or compensation of officers or servants transferred to the Port authority, and the Conservancy and their property shall be free and discharged from all liability in respect thereof.'"—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Attorney-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 696

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 696

Mr. Churchill 697

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 51 to 60 agreed to.

Mr. Bonar Law 697

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 697

Sir F. Banbury 698

Mr. Bonar Law 699

Lord R. Cecil 699
Mr. Lloyd-George 699

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bonar Law 700
Sir F. Banbury 700
Mr. Lloyd-George 701
Mr. Morton 701

Schedule 1:

Mr. Morton 702

Amendment moved—

"In page 49, line 18, to leave out the words 'persons, and either wholly or partly of.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. Morton 703

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Morton 704

Amendment proposed—

"In page 50, line 11, at end, to insert the words 'All the meetings of the Port authority shall be open to the public unless otherwise determined by the majority of the members present and voting on that question.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Churchill 705
Mr. Morton 706

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Holt 706

Amendment proposed—

"In page 50, line 42, to leave out from the word 'authority' to end of paragraph."—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. Morton 707

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Dickinson 708

Amendment proposed—

"In page 51, line 29, to leave out the word 'twelve,' and insert the word 'ten.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'twelve' stand part of the Schedule."

Sir A. Spicer 709

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Dickinson 709

Amendment proposed—

"In page 51, line 29, after the word last inserted, to insert the words 'and in the case of members appointed by the London County Council 1910.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Holt 709

Amendment proposed—

"In page 52, to leave out lines 33 to 37, inclusive."—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. Churchill 710
Mr. Holt 711

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 54, line 32, after the word 'craft' to insert the words 'or other person.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Seaverns 711

Amendment proposed—

"In page 55, line 28, to leave out subsection (17)."—(*Mr. Seaverns.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. Churchill 712

Amendment negatived.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 369.]

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at four minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, 13TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Land Judge's Court (Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 323.] 713

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Report, No. 583 (Southern Nigeria); to lie upon the Table 713

East India (Proclamations).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 324.] 713

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Distress Committees—Grouped Districts 713
Trawling off the Bell Rock 713
Meat Inspection in Scotland 714
Reports of School Inspectors 714
Small Holdings 714
Wages Census 725
Goods Traffic from Nottingham to the North 725

Suggested Displacement of Civilians by Military in Dublin Post Office ... 725
Defective Cottage at Mill Street ... 726
Questions on Friday ... 726

Licensing Bill.—As amended, considered.

The Solicitor-General (Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.) ... 727

New clause—

"(1) Nothing in the Licensing Acts with respect to closing hours shall prevent the supply of intoxicating liquor in any licensed premises on Sunday during any hours during which those premises might have been open on Sunday for the sale of intoxicating liquor before the passing of this Act to any person taking a meal on the premises in a room set apart for the purpose. (2) It is hereby declared that notwithstanding anything in the Licensing Acts with respect to the closing of licensed premises refreshments (other than intoxicating liquor) may be supplied to any person during closing hours, and no persen is liable to any penalty under the Licensing Acts for supplying any such refreshments, or for being on licensed premises during closing hours for the purpose of obtaining any such refreshments."—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. G. D. Faber (York) ... 735
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) ... 740
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) ... 743
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) ... 745
Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) ... 748
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) ... 750
Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock) ... 752
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) ... 753
Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) ... 754
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) ... 756
Mr. Clavell Salter (Hants, Basingstoke) ... 759
Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) ... 762
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) ... 764
Mr. S. Collins (Lambeth, Kennington) ... 766
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) ... 768
Mr. Sherwell (Huddersfield) ... 771
Mr. Maclean (Bath) ... 774
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ... 776
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) ... 776
Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne) ... 778
Mr. Richardson (Nottingham, S.) ... 778
Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) ... 779
Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall) ... 779
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) ... 781
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) ... 781
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) ... 782
Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth) ... 783
Sir S. Evans ... 784
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) ... 785
Mr. Asquith ... 787
Mr. Markham (Notts. Mansfield) ... 789
Colonel Walker (Lancs. Widnes) ... 790

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 199 ; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 377.)

Mr. Luttrell ... 793
Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) ... 794

Amendment proposed to the clause—

"To leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. Luttrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'Sunday,' line 4, stand part of the clause."

Sir S. Evans ... 795
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) ... 795
Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N.E.) ... 796
Sir Arthur Bignold (Wicks Burghs) ... 797
Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.) ... 797

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Samuel Roberts ... 798
Sir F. Banbury ... 798

And, it being Five of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 17th July, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the clause under consideration.

Question put, "That the clause be added to the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 205 ; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 378.)

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Questions on the new Clause and the Amendments moved by the Government of which Notice had been given which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 11th November.

New clause—

"(1) When a poll for a Parliamentary election takes place in any constituency, no person shall, during the hours of poll, sell or expose for sale any intoxicating liquor in any licensed premises except to persons lodging on the premises, and to persons taking meals on the premises in a room set apart for the purpose, and in the case of railway refreshment rooms at a station, to persons arriving at or departing from the station by rail, and subject to those exceptions, no person shall during those hours be on any licensed premises for the purpose of obtaining or consuming intoxicating liquor. (2) If any person acts in contravention of this provision he shall be liable in respect of each offence to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question put, "That the clause be added to the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 209 ; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 379.)

Amendments proposed :—

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out from the word 'scale,' to end of subsection."

"In page 2, line 6, at end to insert the words 'Provided that this provision shall not prevent a new licence being granted for any premises which are constructed, fitted, and intended to be used in good faith for any purpose to which the holding of an on-licence is merely auxiliary, in cases where the Licensing Commission give their consent, on being satisfied that under the special circumstances of the case the grant of the licence is reasonably required in order to meet the wants of the district or of persons resorting to the district, and that such conditions will be imposed as will prevent the misuse of the licence to be granted.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 380.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the word 'district,' and to insert the words 'parish or area.' "

"In page 2, line 35, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.' "

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.' "

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out subsection (7).' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

And, it being Five of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Annual Report of proceedings under The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, etc., for the year 1907 ... 809

Transvaal.—Correspondence relating to a proposal to recruit labour in Madagascar for employment in the Transvaal Mines 809

Colonies: Annual.—No. 583. Southern Nigeria. No. 584. Report on the work of the Imperial Institute. No. 585. Barbadoes. 809

Judicial Statistics (Scotland) Act, 1896.—Report of 809

Irish Land Commission.—Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of March, 1908.

Presented and ordered to lie on the table 809

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade Nos. CXXVII.—CXLVI. 809

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the borough council of Nelson ... 809

Penal Servitude Acts, 1853–1891 (Conditional Licence).—Order granted to Mary Ann Spillane.

Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table 809

TERRITORIAL ARMY.—PERMANENT STAFF.

The Earl of Dartmouth 810
The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Lucas) 813
The Earl af Dartmouth 816
Lord Saye and Sele 817
The Marquess of Salisbury 817

RECRUITING FOR THE ARMY.

Lord Monkswell 818

Moved "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers showing the steps taken by the War Office to provide technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life." (*Lord Monkswell.*)

Lord Haversham 827
Lord Sage and Sele 829
The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Lucas) 830
Viscount Midleton 832
Lord Monkswell 834
The Earl of Erroll 835

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at Twenty minutes past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. 838

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 838

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Council of of the Borough of Nelson; to lie upon the Table 838

Penal Servitude Acts (Conditional Licence).—Order granted to Mary Anne Spillane; to lie upon the Table 838

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Colonial Report, No. 584 (Report on the work of the Imperial Institute for 1906–7); No. 585 (Barbadoes, Report for 1907–8); to lie upon the Table 838

Transvaal.—Correspondence relating to a proposal to recruit labour in Madagascar for employment in the Transvaal Mines; to lie upon the Table 838

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts; to lie upon the Table ... 839

Irish Land Commission.—Return of Advances made under The Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of March, 1908; to lie upon the Table ... 839

Judicial Statistics (Scotland).—Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland for the year 1907; to lie upon the Table 839

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade; to lie upon the Table 839

Page

Bank of England.—Return of the amount of the Notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 28th October, 1908, which have been written off; to lie upon the Table 839

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Murders in the Metropolitan Police District 839
Increased Pay for Auxiliary Rural Postmen 840
German Customs Union and the Registration of Merchandise 841
War Office Stores Purchased from Foreign Firms... 841
Members of the Government and Special Police Patrols 845
Scottish School Board Electors 845
Assassination of a Bengali Detective 846
Distribution of Untenanted Lands on the Reynell Estate 847
Tenants and Land of the Congested Districts Board 847
Irish Land Purchase 847
Road Improvements at Woolwich 848
Christchurch Sewage Scheme 849
Patent Rights of Mr. J. Bielefield, of Hammersmith 849
Clerical Staff of Post Office Provincial Superintending Engineers' Offices ... 850
Post Office Clerks and the Washing of Office Towels 850
School Fees in Scotland 850
Ground Purchased for School at Cathcart Bridge 851
Civil Service Clerkships 852
International Copyright Convention 852
Pay of the First Sea Lord... 853
Drainage from Carnadoc Co operative Creamery 853
Evicted Tenants—Application from Samuel Keys 854
Inspection of Untenanted Land on the Caldbeck Estate 854

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Speed of the New Destroyers 855
Defence of Esquimault 856
Rosyth 857
London and Admiralty Contracts 858
British and Foreign Naval Estimates 859
The New Destroyers... 860
Dockyard Pay Concession 860
The Australian Squadron 860
Naval Standards 861
Capital Ships... 862
War Office Purchases Abroad 862
The Curragh—Officers' Quarters 863
Carlow Barracks 863
One-Room Married Quarters 864
The Irish Command 864

Nov. 16.] *Page*

Beresford Barrack, Curragh... ... 864
War Office and Small Holdings ... 865
Sedition in India.—Kanai's Funeral ... 866
Punjab Judgeship ... 867
Indian Army Pensions ... 868
Transvaal Civil Service ... 868
Education of Indian Children in Natal ... 869
White Labour in the Transvaal Mines ... 869
Stalls in Station Road, Forest Gate ... 869
The Aliens Act ... 870
Factory Inspectorships ... 870
New Home Rule Campaign—Visit of Irish Americans ... 871
International Copyright Conference ... 872
Distress Committees ... 873
Central Bodies and the Unemployment Relief Act, 1905... 873
Married Couples and Old-Age Pensions ... 874
Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee ... 875
Afforestation Schemes ... 875
Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief ... 875
Imported Meat ... 876
Postmen in E.C. District ... 877
Overtime in the General Post Office ... 877
Medical Aid for M.P.'s. ... 878
The Galleries of the House ... 879
The Serpentine ... 879
Voluntary School Managers and Motor Warning Signs ... 879
Control of the Feeble-minded ... 879
Parliament and the Fair Wage Resolution... 880
Scottish School Grants ... 880
Scottish Paupers ... 881
Black Scab in Ireland ... 882
County Mayo Evicted Tenants ... 882
Irish Land Purchase Acts ... 883
Land Transfer and Fishery Rights in Ireland ... 884
Irish Constabulary Bill ... 884
Dursey Island ... 885
Castletown Bere Labourers' Cottages ... 885
Doolin Constabulary Charge ... 886
Bodyke Evicted Tenants ... 888
Connaught Winter Assizes ... 888
Wade Estate, Meath ... 889
Colonel Lyster Smythe's Estate ... 889
Irish Land Purchase ... 890
Irish Constabulary Bill ... 890
Downpatrick Postal Arrangement ... 890

Nov. 16.] *Page*

The Duration of the Session ... 891
English Education Bill ... 891
Scottish Education Bill ... 892
Curates and Convocation ... 892
Licensing Bill—Sunday Opening ... 892
Duties of Innkeepers ... 893

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate the Registration of Nurses," [Nurses Registration Bill [Lords]] 893

Licensing Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.) ... 893
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) ... 898

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, to leave out Clause 3."—(*Mr. Patrick White.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'and,' in page 3, line 18, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) ... 903
Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.) ... 905
Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich) ... 906
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) ... 908
Mr. Chas. Roberts (Lincoln) ... 912
Earl Winterton (Sussex, Horsham) ... 920
Mr. Maclean (Bath) ... 923
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) ... 924
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) ... 934
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) ... 942
Mr. Simon (Essex, Walthamstow) ... 944
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) ... 946

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 261; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 381.)

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'licence whether an.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 382.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words, 'or an off-licence.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 383.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 24, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that until the expiration of seven years after the termination of the

reduction period there shall be no power to attach to the re-grant of an old on-licence any condition for securing to the public the monopoly value of the licence.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 270; Noes, 29. (Division List No. 384.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 26, at the end, to insert the words 'shall not be applicable to off-licences and.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 234; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 385.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 30, to leave out Paragraph (*b*) of subsection (2) of Clause 3.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 265; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 386.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 15, to leave out the words 'Subject to the foregoing provision,' and to insert the words 'Except as provided by this section with respect to the limitation of optional reduction by the financial provisions of this Act and the exclusion of appeal in the case of a licence extinguished in pursuance of a scheme for statutory reduction.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 387.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out the words 'an old on-licence,' and to insert the words 'all old on-licences.' "

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 18, to leave out the words 'have for the time being with respect to other on-licences,' and to insert the words 'had with respect to the renewal or transfer of alehouse licences before the passing of the Licensing Act, 1904.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 251; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 388.)

The First Commissioner of Works (*Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale*) 977

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, at the end, to insert—(2) On the expiration of a period of seven years after the termination of the reduction period any powers under the Licensing Acts for the purpose of securing to the public the monoply value of an off-licence may be exercised on the renewal of an off-licence in the same manner as they may be exercised on the grant of a new on-licence."—(*Mr. L. Harcourt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 978
Mr. Clavell Salter (*Hants, Basingstoke*) 979
Mr. Younger (*Ayr Burghs*) 981
The Solicitor-General (*Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid*) 982
Mr. Gretton (*Rutland*) 985
Mr. Younger 987

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'may,' and to insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to consequential Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 988
Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock) 993

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'Provided that the conditions to be attached to the granting of new off-licences shall include such conditions as the justices think best adapted for ensuring that the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be carried on separately from the sale of other commodities, and that such liquors be separately charged and paid for.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir S. Evans 994

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Samuel Roberts 996
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1002

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 2, to leave out Clause 6."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'first' in page 5, line 3, stand part of the Bill."

Sir S. Evans 1002

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 271; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 389.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 5, line 34, after the word 'licences,' to insert the word 'proposed.'"

"In page 5, line 36, to leave out the first word 'the,' and to insert the words 'any such.'"

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'licence,' to insert the words 'which they decide to extinguish.'"

"In page 5, line 37, to leave out the words '1828 to 1906.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."—(*Mr. L. Harcourt.*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

Nov. 17.]. Page

Whereupon, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Eighteen minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

BARON KILMAINE—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of John Edward Deane, Baron Kilmaine in the Peerage of Ireland to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1009

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Treaty Series No. 28 (1908).—Agreement and protocol between the United Kingdom and Germany with regard to sleeping sickness 1009

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—No. 4166, 4170. 1009

Miscellaneous Series.—No. 669. France. Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table... 1009

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Order made by the Council of the County of Durham 1009

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 (Regulations made by the Local Government Board).—Supplemental Regulations amending the Regulations Organisation for Unemployed, 1905. Regulations rescinding the supplemental regulations and making further regulations for the like purpose 1009

Bank of England.—Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 28th October, 1908, which have been written off.

Laid before the House, and ordered to lie on the Table 1009

College Charter Act, 1871.—Application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol.

Laid before the House, and to be printed. [No. 226] 1010

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill.

Lord Atkinson 1010

Moved, "To dispense with so much of Standing Order No. XXXVIII as provides that the eight sitting days notice of Second Reading required when a Bill brought from the House of Commons has remained on the Table of this House for twelve sitting days without any Lord giving notice of the Second Reading thereof shall not be given notice after the first day of August."—*(Lord Atkinson)*.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill.—Report of Amendments received.

Earl of Donoughmore 1011

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 14, after the word 'the' to insert the word 'reasonable.'"—*(The Earl of Donoughmore.)*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Earl of Donoughmore 1011

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'allotted' to insert the words 'regard being had to the number of the representatives for whom accommodation is likely to be required, and the size of the room in which the meetings of the local authority are held.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1011

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 1012

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, lines 13 to 20, to leave out subsection (2),"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 1012
Lord Allendale 1012
Lord Belper 1013

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1013

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'representatives," to insert the following new subsection: '(3) Three clear days at least before any meeting of the local authority, notice of the time and place of the intended meeting and of the business proposed to be transacted thereat, signed by the clerk or other responsible officer, shall be fixed in some conspicuous place on or near the outer door of the place of meeting of the local authority. Provided that this subsection shall not apply as respects any meeting of a local authority of which not less than three clear days public notice is required by any statute or regulation to be given.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

The Earl of Camperdown 1014
Lord Allendale 1014
The Earl of Donoughmore 1014
Lord Belper 1015

On Question, Amendment negatived.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1015

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 4 to insert the following new clause: 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prohibit a local authority from admitting the public to its meetings.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Belper 1015

Amendment to the Amendment moved—

"To insert at the end of the proposed new clause the words and, subject to the accommodation available, the public shall have the right of admission to meetings of local authorities at all times when the Press is admitted to such meetings under this Act.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 227.)

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Enfranchisement of Women.—3 Petitions for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1016

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1016

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1016

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4166 to 4170; to lie upon the Table 1016

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 669; to lie upon the Table 1017

Treaty Series (No. 28, 1908).—Agreement and Protocol between the United Kingdom and Germany with regard to Sleeping Sickness; to lie upon the Table 1017

Treaty Series (No. 29, 1908).—Protocol between the United Kingdom, the Independent State of the Congo, France, Germany, Portugal and Spain, prohibiting the Importation of Fire-arms, Ammunition, etc., within a certain zone in Western Equatorial Africa; to lie upon the Table ... 1017

Treaty Series No. 30, 1908).—Accession of Liberia to the International Copyright Convention of 9th September, 1886, and the Additional Act and Declaration of 4th May, 1896; to lie upon the Table 1017

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Order made by the Council of the County of Durham; to lie upon the Table 1017

College Charter Act, 1871.—Application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol; to lie upon the Table 1017

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.—Copies presented, of Regulations made by the Local Government Board; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Leave of Postal Officials 1018
County Councils and Motor Car Speeds 1018
Leasing of Foreshores 1019
Payments from Vote 32, Class 2. Subhead A. 1020
Small Holdings—Eviction in Bedfordshire 1021
Small Holdings at Oxted (Surrey) 1022
Imprisonment of Persons under Sixteen Years of Age 1022
Unemployment—Case of Dillon 1023
Relief of Unemployed at Whitechapel 1023
Relief of Unemployed where no Distress Committee exists 1024
Changes in the Coastguards Service 1025
Condition of Schools at Limpsfield 1025

Suggested Close Time for Herrings 1025
Legal Expenses of Irish Local Bodies 1026
Irish Local Government Auditors 1026
Tenders for Performance of Legal Work 1027
Purchase of Townlands of Toames, County Cork 1027

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarines 1028
New Destroyers 1028
Rosyth 1029
H.M.S. "Bulwark" 1029
Refitting of Battleships 1029
Hepburn-on-Tyne Dock 1030
Admiralty Granite Contracts 1030
H.M.S. "Hindustan" 1031
Horses for the Territorial Associations 1031
Army Horses 1031
Indian Government Contracts—Fair Wages Clause 1032
Liquor Trade in India 1032
Indian Government Purchases in Belgium 1033
South Indian Labour Agency in Ceylon 1033
Evictions of Natives in the Transvaal 1033
Nigerian Spirit Imports 1034
State Socialism in Crown Colonies 1034
Wesley College, Colombo 1035
Colombo Graving Dock 1035
Ceylon Government Workshops 1035
Orange River Colony Loan 1036
British Passports in Russia 1036
Brigandage in Egypt 1037
Egyptian Administrations 1038
Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims against Russia 1038
Conviction of Arthur Jones 1039
Flogging Sentences at Northallerton Quarter Sessions 1039
The Imprisoned Suffragists 1040
Books for Prisoners 1042
French Import Duties on Limes 1043
Railway Combines.—Investments in Railway Stocks 1044
Working Railway Agreements 1044
Imports of German and Belgian Steel and Iron 1045
Unemployed Records 1046
Old-Age Pensions 1046
Distress Committee Areas 1047
Cheshire Roads 1048
Provision for Hungry School Children 1048

Nov. 17.]

Page
School Inspectors' Reports 1049
Tuberculin Test at Aberystwyth College 1050
Small Holdings in Durham 1051
Radnorshire Small Holdings 1051
Small Holdings' Return 1052
Ordnance Survey Maps 1052
New Forest Roads 1052
Estate Duty Office Clerical Staff 1053
Admiralty Second Division Clerks 1054
Customs Statistical Department—Overtime 1054
Tobacco Growing in Scotland 1055
Old-Age Pensions 1055
Customs Superintendents 1059
British Investments Abroad 1060
Foreign Investors in British Securities 1060
Civil Service Superannuation 1060
Edinburgh Gas Commissioners' Pensioners 1061
Motor Speeds in Scotland 1061
Irish Civil Services 1062
Horse Breeding in Ireland 1062
Dublin Crown Jewels 1063
Evicted Tenants—Case of Mrs. Riggs 1064
Irish Ranch Land 1064
Ballylassan Cattle-Drive 1064
Ballinameen Cattle-Drive 1065
Colthurst Estate, Ballyvourney 1065
Crookenden and Casey Estates, Cavan 1067
Thomastown Estate, Meath 1068
Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy 1069
The Tuberculosis Bill 1069
Economy of Parliamentary Time 1069
Regulation of Clubs 1070
Rosyth 1071
English Education Bill 1071
Ladybank Councillors' Grievance 1071
Grand Committee Procedure 1072

Nurses Registration Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 370] 1073

Companies Consolidation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time: to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 371] 1073

NEW BILL.

Post Office Savings Bank (Public Trustee Bill).—To be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 372] 1073

Licensing Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 1073
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) 1080

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 11, to leave out Clause 10.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out down to the word 'the' in page 7, line 13, stand part of the Bill."

The Solicitor-General (Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid) 1086
Mr. Bertram (Herts, Hitchin) 1092
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 1094
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1098
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 1100
Mr. J. M. Henderson (Aberdeenshire, W.) 1105
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 1110
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby)... 1114
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1120
The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) ... 1128
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1136
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)... 1144
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1145
Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.) 1151
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 1152
Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh District) 1158
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 1164
Mr. Richardson (Nottingham, S.) 1168

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. Deputy-Speaker proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'the,' in page 7, line 13, stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 287; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 390.)

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER then proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 15, after the word 'for,' to insert the words 'a number of years being the number of.'"—(*Sir S. Evans*).

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 16, after the word 'period,' to insert the words 'with three years added thereto in each case, and.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 293; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 391.)

Amendments proposed—

In page 7, line 18, to leave out the words 'with the addition of,' and to insert the word 'and.'"

"In page 7, line 19, to leave out the word 'add,' and to insert the word 'allow.'"

Nov. 17.] *Page*

"In page 7, line 23, after the word 'regard,' to insert the words 'in each case.'"

"In page 7, line 25, after the word 'licence,' to insert the word 'but.'"

"In page 8, line 1, to leave out the words 'shall be,' and to insert the word 'is.'"

"In page 8, line 13, to leave out the word 'additional.'"

"In page 8, line 13, after the word 'sums,' to insert the word 'payable.'"

"In page 8, line 22, to leave out the word 'additional.'"

"In page 8, line 22, after the word 'sums,' to insert the word 'payable.'"

"In page 10, line 12, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that for the purposes of this provision statutory reduction does not include further reduction.'"

"In page 11, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words '(which provides for appeals in the case of the refusal to renew or transfer a licence.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 11, line 36, after the word 'exercise,' to insert the word 'all.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 300, Noes, 95. (Division List No. 392.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, lines 36 to 38, to leave out the words 'to the renewal and transfer of licences under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, and this Act,' and to insert the words 'licensing justices except their powers as to the confirmation of new licences.'"

"In page 12, line 26, at end, to insert the words 'In the absence from any cause of the chairman of the Court from any meeting of the Court, the members of the Court present shall choose one of their number to act as chairman.'"

"In page 12, line 33, at end, to insert the words '(6) The licensing appeal authority may make rules as to the costs to be incurred in any proceedings for confirmation of new licences, and as to the person by whom those costs are to be paid.'"

"In page 12, line 40, after the word 'last,' to insert the word 'published.'"—(*Sir. S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill. [BY ORDER.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (*Sir H. Kearley, Devonport*) 1181

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir H. Kearley.*)

Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1183
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1183
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1183
Sir H. Kearley 1184

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday, 30th November, at a quarter past Eight of the Clock.

CONSTABULARY (IRELAND) [PAY, ETC.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to make further provision for the pay of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and for the pensions, pension allowances, and gratuities payable to them, their widows, and children.—(*Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow 1184

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.—Report from the Committee for Privileges that the Petitioner Albert Kirby Fairfax hath made out his claim to the peerage title, dignity, and honour of Baron Fairfax of Cameron in the Peerage of Scotland; made, and agreed to; and resolved and judged accordingly; and Resolution and Judgment to be laid before His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves, and to be transmitted to the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland: Ordered that all deeds, documents, and papers produced on behalf of the Petitioner by his agent, be delivered to the said agent

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.—The evidence taken before the Committee for Privileges to be printed 1185

BARON KILMAINE.—Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Tuesday last, that the right of the Baron Kilmaine to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill, viz.: E. Cromer (chairman), L. Colchester, L. Monk Bretton, L. Blyth, L. MacDonnell; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 1185

Nov. 18.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Treaty Series.—No. 29 (1908). Protocol between the United Kingdom, the Independent State of the Congo, France, Germany, Portugal, and Spain, prohibiting the importation of fire-arms, ammunition, etc., within a certain zone in Western Equatorial Africa.—No. 30 (1908). Accession of Liberia to the International Copyright Convention of 9th September, 1886, and the Additional Act and Declaration of 4th May, 1896. 1186

Colonies: Annual.—No. 586. Somaliland Protectorate; No. 587. Trinidad and Tobago; No. 588. Sierra Leone. Presented and ordered to lie on the Table 1186

Post Office.—Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post (Salonica—Constantinople), The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 25) Warrant, 1908; Foreign and Colonial Post except Parcels. The Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1908. Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table 1186

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PRECEDENCE FOR BILLS.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1186

Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended, and that on and after Wednesday, 2nd day of December next, for the remainder of the session the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh*).

The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1189
The Marquess of Londonderry 1190
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1190
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1191

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill.—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 3a.

Lord Denman 1192

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 26, after the word 'ascertain,' to insert the words 'and certify.'"—(*Lord Denman*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Lord Denman 1192

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 37, after the word 'order,' to insert the following new subsection: '(6) The provisions of this section shall extend to Orders of the Local Government Board made after the passing of this Act upon petitions of local authorities presented before the passing of this Act.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 15, after the word 'Acts' to insert the words 'Section 71 and,'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

Page

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 1193
Lord Atkinson 1193
Lord Denman 1194
The Lord Chancellor 1194
Lord Atkinson 1194
Lord Ashbourne 1195

Moved, "That the debate on the Amendment be adjourned."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Further debate adjourned till To-morrow.

College Charter Act, 1871.—Order made yesterday for printing the application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol, discharged 1196

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

New Writ.—New Writ for the County of Essex (Mid or Chelmsford Division), in the room of Major Sir Frederic Carne Rasch, Baronet (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Henry Forster*) 1196

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords].—Reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table 1196

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1196

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Factory and Workshop (Special Exception).—Meal Times. Paper to be printed. [No. 325] 1196

Factory and Workshop (Special Exception).—Holidays.—Paper to be printed. [No. 326] 1197

Factory and Workshop (Special Exception).—Employment inside and outside on the same day.—Paper to be printed. [No. 327] 1197

Factory and Workshop (Special Exception).—Overtime.—Paper to be printed. [No. 328] 1197

College Charter Act, 1871.—Paper to be printed. [No. 329] 1197

Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.—Paper to be printed.—[No. 330] ... 1197

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Post).—Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1197

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 25) Warrant, 1908; to lie upon the Table... 1197

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Colonial Reports, (Nos. 586, 587, 588); to lie upon the Table 1198

Nov. 18.] *Page*

Patents and Designs Act, 1907.—Order made by the Board of Trade under Section 8 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907; to lie upon the Table ... 1198

Board of Education.—Regulations providing for Special Grants in aid of certain Local Education Authorities in England and Wales in 1908–9; to lie upon the Table 1198

Secondary Schools, Etc. (Pupils).—Return ordered, "showing the total number of pupils in the secondary schools and pupil teacher centres mentioned in the list of recognised schools recently published" [Cd. 4374] ... 1198

Civil Contingencies Fund, 1907–8.—Copy ordered, "of Accounts of the Civil Contingencies Fund, 1907–8" 1199

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Trying of Cromarty Police-Court Cases at Dingwall and Tain 1199
Old-Age Pension Regulations 1200
Prosecution of William McKinley for Reckless Navigation 1200
Applications for Small Holdings in West Suffolk 1200
Demonstrations against the Tribes in the Tibul Basran 1201
Report of the Truck Committee 1202
Treatment of Imprisoned Suffragists 1202
Applications for Distress Committees Refused 1203
Amending Regulation 25 of Old-Age Pensions 1205
Distress Committees—Applicants for Work—Reasons for Leaving 1206
Applications for Small Holdings 1206
Old-Age Pensions—Calculation of means of Irish Farmers 1206
Irish Land Purchase Agreements 1207
Naval Expenditure of Great Britain, France, Germany and Russia 1208

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Devonport Dockyard 1211
Cheap Ammunition for Rifle Clubs 1211
Parkhurst Barracks Baths 1212
British Garrison in India 1212
Charitable Pensions and Old-Age Pensions 1213
Parkhurst Prison Baths 1213
Pentonville Prisoners' Blunder 1214
Telegraph Messengers and Adult Duties 1214
Morocco Postal System—Cash on Delivery 1215
Adult Night Messengers in the Post Office 1215
Conditions of the Education Grant 1216
Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1217
Buildings on Small Holdings 1217
Records of Applications for Small Holdings 1218
Proposed Register of Applications 1218
Small Holdings in Sussex 1219
Appeals against Rejections of Applications for Small Holdings 1220
County Council Administration of the Act 1220

Page

Small Holdings in Surrey 1220
Records of Applications for Small Holdings 1221
Small Holdings Finance 1222
Small Holdings Records 1222
Small Holdings in Staffordshire 1223
Undischarged Bankrupts—Case of Mr. E. T. Hooley 1223
Boycotting at Riverstown 1224
Towerhill (Claremorris) Cattle-Drive 1225
East Clare Moonlight Outrage 1225
Ballyvourney Labourer's Cottage 1225
Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors 1226
Labourers' Cottage Scheme in Charleville 1226
Cork Land Purchase Scheme 1227
Land Purchase Statistics 1229
Civilian Employment at Cork Barracks 1231
Riverstown (Sligo) Postmaster 1231

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 331]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 331]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 373] 1232

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 1232

Licensing Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 1232
Earl Winterton (Sussex, Horsham) 1239

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out Clause 18."—(*Sir Gilbert Parker.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'except,' in page 13, line 4, stand part of the Bill."

The Solicitor-General (Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1243
Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) 1250
Mr. Hodge (Lancashire, Gorton) 1255
Mr. Fletcher (Hampstead) 1257
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1259
Mr. Lane-Fox (York, W.R., Barkston Ash) 1263
Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) 1265
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1267
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1271
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1276
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 1277
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) 1278
Mr. Timothy Davies (Fulham) 1280
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1280

Nov. 18.]

Page
Mr. McCallum (Paisley) 1282
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1283
Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth) 1285

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 256 ; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 393.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, lines 4 and 5, to leave out the words 'one hour,' and to insert the words 'three hours.'"—*(Sir S. Evans.)*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1289
Sir S. Evans 1290
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) 1291

Question put, "That the words 'one hour' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 79 ; Noes, 288. (Division List No. 394.)

Proposed words inserted in the Bill.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 5, to leave out the words '3 p.m., and for any two hours between 6 p.m. and.'"—*(Sir S. Evans.)*

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 285 ; Noes 89. (Division List No. 395.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 7, at the end to insert the words 'subject to the condition that one of the hours so fixed must be between noon and 3 p.m. Provided that, in the application of this provision to premises in the Metropolitan district, four hours shall be substituted for three hours and 11 p.m. shall be substituted for 10 p.m.'"—*(Sir S. Evans.)*

Question put, "That the Amendment be made.'"

The House divided :—Ayes, 294 ; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 396.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, to leave out lines 12 and 13.'"—*(Sir S. Evans.)*

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 283; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 397.)

Mr. James Hope 1307
Mr. Younger 1310

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 12, to leave out Clause 20."—*(Mr. James Hope.)*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'arrangements,' in page 14, line 15, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Gooch (Bath) 1313
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 1315
Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) 1322
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 1326

Sir S. Evans 1329
Mr. Rawlinson 1335

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 286 ; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 398.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 14, line 24, at the end, to insert the words '(*e*) the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor or of any kind of intoxicating liquor before the hour of 8 a.m. on any day.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 287 ; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 399.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 27, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 288 ; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 400.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 29, to leave out the words 'closing of the premises,' and to insert the words 'prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor for consumption on the premises except to persons lodging on the premises and persons taking meals on the premises in a room set apart for that purpose.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 289 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 401.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 14, line 30, to leave out the words 'Parliamentary or.'"

"In page 15, line 28, at the end to insert the words 'Provided that in the event of the death of the holder of any such excepted excise licence after the commencement of this Act end before the time when the first application is made for a justices' licence, the person (if any) to whom the excepted excise licence has been transferred shall be deemed to have held that licence at the commencement of this Act.'"

"In page 15, line 33, after the word 'cider' to insert the words 'and perry.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

Whereupon, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The Lord Westbury took the oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education.—Regulations providing for special grants in aid of certain local education authorities in England and Wales in 1908–1909 ... 1353

Patents and Designs Act, 1907.—Rule made by the Board of Trade in pursuance of the power conferred upon them by Section 8 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907.

Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 1353

Census of Production Act, 1907.—Rules made by the Board of Trade, CXLVII.—CLXI. Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table 1353

Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill.—Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on an Amendment, moved after the Third Reading on the previous day, in Clause 11 (Amendment of the Land Clauses Act, 1845).

Lord Denman 1353

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Ashbourne 1354

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 17, to leave out the words 'one hundred' and to insert the word 'sixty.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

Lord Denman 1354
Lord Atkinson 1354

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 18, after the word 'pounds' to insert the words 'Provided that the sums paid under the provisions of Section 72 of the first mentioned statute by any particular local authority in respect of any interest in land taken under any scheme or schemes to a person or persons not absolutely entitled to the interest purchased shall not exceed in the aggregate three hundred pounds.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1355

On Question, First Amendment agreed to.

Lord Denman 1355
Lord Atkinson 1356
The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 1356

On Question, Second Amendment agreed to.

Lord Atkinson 1356

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, lines 3 and 4, to leave out the words 'for public or charitable purposes' and to insert the words 'in trust for some charitable purpose, or for some particular public purpose specified or defined, as distinguished from the general purposes of a municipality or township or the general benefit or advantage of the inhabitants thereof.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

Lord Denman 1357

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1357

Amendment moved—

"To insert the following new clause :—'This Act shall not apply to any town the population of which at the last Census was less than two thousand.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Denman 1358
Lord Ashbourne 1359
The Earl of Crewe 1359

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Moved, "That the Bill do pass."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.].—Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1360

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1360

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived, and the Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 228]

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Lord Kenyon 1361
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1361

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Enfranchisement of Women.—Petition for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1362

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Civil Contingencies Fund. 1907-8.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 332] 1362

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Annual Report of the Intelligence Division, Part II.; to lie upon the Table 1362

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act; to lie upon the Table 1362

Nov. 19.] *Page*

Government Departments (Contracts).—Return ordered, "of all Contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1908, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from abroad 1362

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Salaries of Minor Staff Officers of Income-Tax Repayments Branch 1362
Irish Public-houses under £5 Valuation 1363
Recruiting of Post Office Telephone Staff 1364
Extra Police in County Galway 1364
Cookstown Creamery Instructor 1367
Christmas Employment in the Post Office... 1367
Penny Postage in America 1368
The Unemployed and Christmas Work in the Post Office 1368
Bastardy Laws 1369
Yacht Lake on Hackney Marshes 1369
Croydon Distress Committee 1369
Local Government Loans 1370
Emigration of the Unemployed 1370
Special Committee of Relief... 1371
Unemployed Women in Manchester 1371
Runcorn Vaccination Case 1371
Customs Statistical Department Staff 1372
Factory Inspectors 1372
Motor Traffic on the Embankment... 1372
Home Office Orders 1373
Meals for School Children 1373
Single-School Areas in Wales 1374
Schools and Scholars in Wales 1374
Education Proposals 1374
Distribution of Education Fund 1375
Lanarkshire Education Grant 1376
New Law Courts 1376
Pension Officers 1377
Wellington (Somerset) Pensions Officials 1377
Check on Pension Officers' Work 1378
Poor Relief and Old-Age Pensions 1378
Instructions to Pension Officers 1379
Professor Marshall's Memorandum on the Fiscal Question 1379
Pension Funds and Income-Tax 1380
Income-Tax and Death Duty Returns 1380
Scottish Volunteer Ranges 1381
Emigrated Reservists 1381
Cheap Ammunition for Rifle Clubs... 1381
Clonelly Evicted Tenants 1382

Page
Marquess of Ely's Fermanagh Lands 1382
Ely Estate Evicted Tenants... 1383
Kilburryhut Evicted Tenants 1383
Roscrea Labourers Cottage Scheme 1383
Small Holdings in Derbyshire 1384
University College Grants 1385
Hammersmith Guardians' Loan 1385
Recouped Poor Relief and Old-Age Pensions 1386
Widows of Foreigners and Old-Age Pensions 1387
Territorial Target Practice 1387
Territorial Officers' Medals 1387
Poona Officers' Houses 1388

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Diadem"—Shipwright's Death from Enteric Fever 1388
Portland Naval Recreation Ground 1389
Naval Building Contracts 1389
Dundee as a Naval Base 1390
Dockyard Employees' Petitions 1391
Greenock Torpedo Factory 1391
Peterhead Harbour of Refuge 1391
Reform of Indian Administration 1392
Alleged Police Corruption in India 1392
Indian Railway Contracts with Belgium 1394
Sedition in Bengal 1395
Indian Government and the Suppression of Sedition 1395
Treatment of Indian Geological Students 1395
Naval Visits to the Colonies 1396
Alleged Flogging of Zulus 1396
Protection of Indian Subjects in Natal 1397
Southern Nigerian Imports of Spirits 1397
Straits Settlements Opium Commission 1398
Opium Traffic in Hong Kong 1398
Hong Kong Budget 1398
Trial by Jury in Rhodesia 1398
Emigrants' Information Office 1399
The Arrest of Mr. Luxenburg 1400
Belgium and the Congo State 1400
Shipping Claim against the Uruguayan Government 1400
International Commission on Opium 1401
Weekly Rest Days 1401
Venezuela 1402
Licensing Commissioners 1402
Small Holdings in Dorsetshire 1403
Dorset Co-operative Small Holdings Associations... 1404

Nov. 19.]

Page

Black Scab Potato Disease 1405
American Gooseberry Mildew 1406
Horse Poisoning at Wellington, Salop 1407
Contagious Mammitis at Wirral 1407
Black Scab in England 1408
Tuberculous Milk in London 1408
Small Holding Co-operative Societies 1409
Small Holdings in Gloucestershire 1410
Foot and Mouth Disease in Pennsylvania 1411
Timber Denudation of Ireland 1411
Black Scab in Irish Potatoes 1412
Liscannon Harbour 1412
Intimidation at Riverstown 1413
United Irish League and Evicted Tenants 1414
Riverstown Riot 1414
Riverstown Grass Ranch 1418
Glencar Evicted Tenants 1419
Irish University Charters 1419
Style Park, Limerick 1419
Warning to Irish Nationalist Newspaper Proprietors 1420
Fort Fergus Cattle-Drive 1420
Marlborough Street Training College 1421
Theft of Cattle in County Clare 1421
Traffic in Firearms in Ireland 1422
Sir George Collhurst's Cork Estate 1423
O'Leary Estate, County Cork 1423
Riverstown Cattle-Drive 1424
Wallis Estate, Cork County 1424
Irish Railway Commission 1424
Galway Extra Police Force 1425
Treatment of Irish Surety Prisoners 1425
Galway Extra Police 1426
Enniscorthy Vaccination Defaulters 1427
Tullarvan Disturbances 1427
Mayo County Council and Old-Age Pensions 1428
Coachford (Cork) Tenants' Grievance 1429
Trawling Prevention Bill 1429
Professor Marshall's Memorandum 1429
Hop Substitutes 1430
Maintenance of Main Roads 1430
Cost of Preparedness for War 1430
Liability of Innkeepers 1413
Irish Land Purchase 1432
Education Bill—Negotiations 1432
Business of the House 1435

Licensing Bill.—As amended, further considered.

Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 1436
Mr Barnard (Kidderminster) 1446

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, line 36, to leave out Clause 24."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'shall,' in page 15, line 37, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Mond (Chester) 1451
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1457
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) 1464
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 1469
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1472
The Solicitor-General (Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1475
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 1483

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 289; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 402.)

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 16, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words 'holder of the licence proves,' and to insert the words 'it is proved.'"

"In page 16, line 28, at end, to insert the words 'and to all the circumstances under which the amount was fixed.'"

"In page 16, line 29, after the word 'sum,' to insert the word 'so.'"

"In page 16, line 30, to leave out the words 'holder of the licence,' and to insert the words 'person appearing to the Commissioners (after requiring, if they think fit, a Report from the licensing justices on the matter) to be entitled thereto.'"

"In page 16, line 33, at end, to insert the words 'in accordance with rules made for the purpose by the Treasury.'"

"In page 17, line 9, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"

"In page 17, line 27, to leave out the words 'consultation with,' and to insert the word 'giving.'"

"In page 17, line 27, at end, to insert the words 'an opportunity for consulting with them.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1494

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 3, to leave out Clause 36.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'local,' in page 20, line 7, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) 1496
Earl Winterton (Sussex, Horsham) 1496
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1497

Nov. 19.] *Page*

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 403.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, lines 7 and 8, to leave out the words 'local stipendiary magistrate or local.' "—*Sir S. Evans.*)

Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*)... 1499
Sir S. Evans 1499

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 20, line 8, to leave out the words 'of summary jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'as hereinafter defined.' "

"In page 20, line 10, to leave out the words 'local stipendiary magistrate or local.' "

"In page 20, line 11, to leave out the words 'a summary jurisdiction.' "

"In page 20, line 16, to leave out the word 'unless,' and to insert the words 'Provided that.' "

"In page 20, line 16, to leave out the word 'is,' and to insert the word 'if.' "

"In page 20, line 16, at end, to insert the words 'failure to make the.' "

"In page 20, line 17, to leave out the words 'not made owing,' and to insert the word 'due.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 17, at end, to insert the words 'may extend the time for making the application, subject to such conditions (if any) as they think fit to impose.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Earl Winterton 1501
Sir S. Evans 1501
Sir F. Banbury 1501
Mr. William Rutherford 1502
Colonel Walker (*Lancashire, Widnes*) 1503

Amendment to the Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the word 'they,' and insert the words 'the Court.' "—(*Colonel Walker.*)

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 1503
Sir S. Evans 1504

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 24, to leave out the words 'licensing justices,' and to insert the word 'Court.' "—(*Sir S. Evans*)

Amendment agreed to.

Earl Winterton 1504
Mr. William Rutherford 1506

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 25, to leave out Clause 37.' "—(*Earl Winterton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any person,' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 1509
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 1511
Mr. Herbert Samuel 1512
Mr. James Parker (Halifax) 1513
Mr. Gretton 1514
Mr. Hart-Davies 1515
Sir E. Carson 1516
Sir S. Evans 1517
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1523
Mr. Verney (Bucks. N.) 1526
Sir F. Banbury 1526
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1528

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 262 ; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 404.)

Sir F. Banbury 1531

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 29, to leave out the word 'mainly.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'mainly' stand part of the Bill."

Sir S. Evans 1532
Earl Winterton 1533

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 288 ; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 405.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 32, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment agreed to.

And it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 34, to leave out the word 'an,' and to insert the words 'any direct or indirect.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 294 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 406.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 34, after the word 'obligation,' to insert the words 'of any kind.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 295 ; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 407.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 20, line 35, to leave out the words 'not being,' and to insert the words 'by reason of that person having a proprietary interest in the club, or in the premises or furniture of the club, or being a creditor of the club, or being in any other manner in a position to control the supply of intoxicating liquor to the club ; Provided that the last-mentioned ground of objection shall not apply in the case of.'

"In page 20, line 39, at end, to insert the words 'and the Court may order the objection to be upheld or dismissed as they think fit.'"

"In page 21, line 32, at end, to add the words '(6) For the purpose of the provisions of this part of this Act relating to the registration and the renewal of the registration of clubs, the expression "Court" means a Metropolitan Police Court as respects any place within the jurisdiction of such Court, a stipendiary magistrate as respects any place within the jurisdiction of such a magistrate, and as respects any other place a Court of Summary Jurisdiction having jurisdiction in that place. (7) Rules of Court may be made under Section twenty-nine of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, with respect to the procedure of the Court, and provision may be made by those rules enabling the Court, in such cases as they think fit, to order security for costs to be given by any objector. (8) The clerk to a stipendiary magistrate shall be substituted for the clerk to the justices as the person to keep the register of clubs under the Licensing Act, 1902, and to exercise and perform all powers and duties under that Act with respect to that register in any place within the jurisdiction of the magistrate, and the register and all other documents relating thereto shall accordingly, if not already in the possession of the clerk to the stipendiary magistrate, be handed over to him. (9) Where a Court of Summary Jurisdiction make an order striking a club off the register, the clerk of the Court if he is not also the clerk of the Court as above defined, shall forthwith send notice of the order to the clerk of that Court.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 28, at the end, to insert the words '(2) Section twenty-eight of the Licensing Act, 1902, shall be read as if any grounds for notice of objection to the registration or renewal of registration of a club under this Act, which are not mentioned in that section, were added thereto as grounds on which a club may be struck off the register.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 291 ; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 408.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 22, line 33, to leave out the first word 'Any,' and to insert the word 'The.'"

"In page 29, line 11, after the word 'holder,' to insert the words 'to a person from whom he is bound by any covenant, agreement, or undertaking, or is otherwise under any direct or indirect obligation of any kind to obtain a supply of intoxicating liquor.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 5, page 33, line 31, to leave out the words 'of Inland Revenue,' and to insert the words 'for the time being having the management of duties of Excise.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 287 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 409.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 34, to leave out lines 11 to 13 inclusive, in second column."

"In page 34, line 38, to leave out from the word 'one,' to the word 'the,' in line 40."

"In page 35, line 14, after the word 'certificate,' to insert the words 'under this Act.'"

"In page 35, to leave out lines 19 to 21, inclusive, in second column."

"In page 35, line 25, to leave out the words 'may be held.'"

"In page 35, line 26, after the word '1828,' to insert the words 'May be held.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

"In page 37, line 16, after the word 'section,' to insert the words 'in Section 43,' the words 'and in a borough the borough justices.'" (*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 374]

Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks) 1553
Mr. J. A. Pease 1554

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

CONSTABULARY (IRELAND) [PAY, ETC.].—Resolution reported:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to make further provision for the pay of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and for the pensions, pension allowances, and gratuities payable to them, their widows, and children.

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Birrell and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Pay and Pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 375] 1554

OLD-AGE PENSIONS (REGULATIONS).

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1555
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1559

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to his Majesty praying him to annul so much of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, 1908, as provides that the pension officers shall, in investigating the claims of applicants, be subject to any further instructions issued for the guidance of pension officers by the Board of Inland Revenue."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1560
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1563
Sir W. Anson (Oxford University) 1564
Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 1565
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 1565
Mr. Lloyd-George 1565
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 1566

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 54; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 410.)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 20TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The Earl Carrington chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners 1569

Licensing Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Wednesday next; The Lord Privy Seal (*E. Crewe.*) [No.] 229 1569

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 20TH NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Presented by Mr. Sinclair; read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Act) to be read a second time upon Monday, 30th November, and to be printed. [Bill 377] 1569

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP M).—Sir LUKE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group M of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock 1569

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

Licensed Premises (Exclusion of Children).—10 Petitions for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1569

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1570

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1570

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1570

Sunday Closing (Shops) Bill [LORDS].—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1570

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Secretary for Scotland, providing for the Early Closing of certain classes of shops in the burgh of Hamilton; to lie upon the Table 1570

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Investment in Consols 1570
Assistance to Scottish Pension Officers 1571
Superannuation of Civil Servants 1571

Page

National Debt—Assets of a definite Cash Value ... 1571

Amount Unissued of Unemployed Grant ... 1571

Old-Age Pensions—Voluntary Contributions ... 1572

Dismissal of Postman D. O'Connell, of Derinagree ... 1572

Black Scab Potato Disease in England ... 1573

Bristol University Charter ... 1574

Postal Officials—Time Spent in Travelling ... 1574

Travelling Expenses of Scottish Department Officials ... 1574

Provision of Meals for School Children ... 1575

Clergy and Income-Tax ... 1576

Restoration of Edward M'Brien, of Derrygonnelly ... 1576

Redistribution of the Baslichane Farm ... 1577

Closing of Carryduff National School ... 1577

Payment of Grant to Irish Junior Assistant School-Mistresses ... 1578

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection. ... 1578

Report to lie upon the table.

NEW BILL.

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill.—Presented by Mr. Runciman, to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 376] ... 1578

Licensing Bill.—Order for the Third Reading read.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) ... 1578

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

Mr. Clavell Salter (Hampshire, Basingstoke) ... 1594

Earl Winterton, (Sussex Horsham) ... 1607

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Simon (Essex, Walthamstow) ... 1615

Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) ... 1623

Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) ... 1634

Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) ... 1643

The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) ... 1653

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 350 ; Noes, 113. (Division List No. 41.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Five o'clock.

Page

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1908.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petitions in favour of: Read, and ordered to lie on the Table. Petitions against: Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1661

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Board of Education (Scheme for a New Teacher's Registration Council).—Correspondence concerning the above, subsequent to the publication of the proposals submitted to the Board of Education by the Representatives of certain Educational Associations... 1678

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Annual Report of the Intelligence Division, Part II.).—Proceedings under the Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907, and Section 2 (subsection 3) of the Board of Agriculture Act, 1889 1678

Africa, No. 5 (1908).—Further correspondence respecting the taxation of natives and other questions in the Congo State 1678

Trade Reports.—(Annual).—No. 4171. United States.
(Miscellaneous).—No. 670. Russia.
Presented, and ordered to lie on the Table 1678

Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897.—Land Transfer Rules, 1908.
Land Transfer Fee Order, 1908.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act, 1907.—Regulations made by the Local Government Board (1) as to foreign meat; (2) as to unsound meat 1679

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—An Order, No. 7599, entitled the "Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1908." 1679

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order by the Secretary of State for Scotland, providing for the early closing of certain classes of shops in the burgh of Hamilton.

Laid before the House and ordered to lie on the Table 1679

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

Earl Roberts 1679

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House the defence of these Islands necessitates the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government to the provision (in addition to a powerful Navy) of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores, and thus give practical effect to the Resolution unanimously agreed to by the House on 10th July, 1905; and that in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in view of altered stragetic conditions in the North Sea, that His Majesty's Government should, following the precedent set by Mr. Balfour in 1905, make a statement on the invasion problem, and should state definitely the conclusions arrived at as the result of the recent inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence."—*Earl Roberts.*)

Lord Lovat 1696
The Earl of Cromer 1704
Viscount Midleton 1707

The Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) ... 1714
Lord Grenfell ... 1725
The Marquess of Lansdowne ... 1730
The Earl of Crewe ... 1736
Earl Cawdor ... 1737
Viscount Milner ... 1738
The Marquess of Salisbury ... 1741
The Earl of Wemyss ... 1741

On Question, "That the Resolution be agreed to."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 74; Not-contents, 32.

Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow ... 1743

House adjourned at ten minutes past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—5 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table ... 1743

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act, 1907.—Regulations made by the Local Government Board: (1) Regulations as to Foreign Meat; (2) Regulations as to Unsound Food; to lie upon the Table ... 1744

Local Taxation Returns (England and Wales).—The Annual Local Taxation Returns for 1906–7. Part I.; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 333] ... 1744

Africa (No. 5, 1908).—Further Correspondence respecting the Taxation of Natives and other questions in the Congo State; to lie upon the Table ... 1744

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4171; to lie upon the Table ... 1745

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 670; to lie upon the Table ... 1745

Members of Parliament.—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 334] ... 1745

Board of Education.—Scheme for a new Teachers' Registration Council; to lie upon the Table ... 1745

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 to 1903.—Order No. 7599, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1908; to lie upon the Table ... 1745

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks). Further Return relative thereto; to be printed. [No. 335].

Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897. Copy of the Land Transfer Rules, 1908.

Land Transfer Act, 1875 and 1897. Copy of the Land Transfer Fee Order, 1908 ... 1745

Nov. 23.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Ballyshannon Postal Service 1746
Navies of Great Britain, France, Russia and Germany... 1746
Deserted Wives and Children in Poor Law Establishments 1747
Unmarried Women and Illegitimate Children Chargeable to the Poor Law ... 1747
Irish Tenants to be dealt with under the Purchase Act of 1903 1748
Small Holdings in Nottinghamshire 1748
Canadian Exports to Great Britain via United States 1748
Promotion of Superintendents in the Customs Service 1749
Moonlighting Outrages in West Clare 1750
Applications under the Irish Land Act 1903 and the Evicted Tenants' Act, 1907 1751
Delay in Inspection of the Killasonna Estate 1752
Tuberculosis Bill—Right of Appeal before Removal 1752
Acquisition of Untenanted Land at Monydonagha 1753
The Police and the Clonquish Band 1753
Attack on House of Mr. C. N. Clark at Holycross 1754
Criminal Lunatics in Irish Asylum 1754
Appointments to the Staff of Depots 1755
Foot and Mouth Disease in Pennsylvania... 1755
Valuation of Cathcart School Board Land at Holmlea 1756
Irish Postal Supplies 1756
Sanitary Condition of Ramsey (Hunts.) 1757
Old-age Pensions—Deductions for Sick Pay 1757
Old-age Pensions Regulations 1758
Order against Bastard Children Born in the Workhouse... 1758
Vaughan's Charitable School, County Fermanagh 1759
Pay of Officers Employed Writing History of South African War 1759
Amounts Issued to meet Capital Expenditure 1760
Light Dues—Expenditure on Lighthouses 1760
Petitions of Dockyard Workmen 1761
Old-age Pensions Committees 1761
Alterations of the Boundaries of the Estate of Penrose, Simla 1762
War Office and Irish Clothing Contracts 1762
Evicted Tenants—Case of Patrick Mulgrew 1763
Irish National Teachers—Payment of Grant for Teaching Mathematics ... 1763
Report of Poor Law Commission 1763
Irish Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief 1764

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The New Destroyers 1764
Coal v. Oil Fuel for Destroyers 1766
Forth and Clyde Canal 1767
Rosyth 1768
British Naval Supremacy 1768
Headquarters Staff 1769

Page
War Office Historical Department 1769
Special Reserve—Training Pay 1770
Brecon Court-Martial on Private Wiltshire 1770
Transvaal Civil Service—Members of British Birth 1771
Rhodesian Native Poll Tax 1772
Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau 1773
Cairo Drainage Scheme 1774
French Routes and English Consols 1775
Unemployment Grant 1776
Bank of England Notes 1776
Old-Age Pensions—Residence Abroad 1777
Pay of Clerks of Pension Committees 1778
Fiscal Policy of International Trade—Mr. Alfred Marshall's Pamphlet ... 1779
Commitments of Rate Defaulters 1779
Florists' Assistants 1780
Approaches to the House 1780
Petrol Accidents 1781
American Wages and Food Prices 1781
Berlin Copyright Conference 1782
Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief 1782
Contributions to Parent's Maintenance 1783
Bastardy Laws 1783
Poplar Unemployed 1784
Westminster Improvement Scheme 1785
Labour Tests 1786
Modified Workhouse Test Order 1786
British Newspapers for the United States and Canada 1787
Single Area School Children 1787
The New Law Courts 1787
Estate Duty Office Clerks 1788
Second Division Clerks 1789
Retirement Allowances 1789
Improvement of Horse Breeding 1790
Civil Service Examinations 1791
Expenditure on Small Holdings 1791
Customs—Statistical Department Abstractors 1792
Small Holdings in Kent 1793
Diseased Pennsylvanian Cattle 1793
Black Scab in Potatoes 1794
English and Irish Agricultural Orders 1794
Food and Drug Adulteration in Scotland 1795
Cahirciveen Evicted Tenants 1795
Riverstown Cattle-Drive Fatality 1796
Kenmare Sub-Land Commission 1797
Intermediate Education Grants for Girls 1797

Nov. 23.] Page

Land Purchase in County Cork 1798
School Inspectors in Ireland 1799
Land Purchase in Galway 1799
Ex-Service Men in Irish Asylums 1800
Longford Telephone Service 1801
Riverstown (Sligo) Postmistress's Husband 1801
Civil Service Superannuation 1802
Town Planning Committee 1802
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill 1803
Stipendiary Curates 1803
Business of the House 1804

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to, Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, with Amendments.

IRISH LAND.

Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1806

Motion made and Question proposed, "That leave be given to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the occupation and ownership of land in Ireland, and for other purposes relating thereto."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 1834
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1846
Mr. William O'Brien (Cork) 1861
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 1870
Mr. Kavanagh (Carlow) 1881
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1884
Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs) 1890
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 1893
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1899
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1908
Mr. Birrell... 1914

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be bought in by Mr. Birrell, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, and Mr. T. W. Russell.

Irish Land Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the occupation and ownership of Land in Ireland, and for other purposes relating thereto," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 378].

Local Government (Scotland) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.... 1916

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXCVI.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JANUARY IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 10*th November*, 1908.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS ACT, 1908.

His Majesty's Answer to the Address of 29th October last, delivered by the Lord Steward (*E. Beauchamp*), and read as follows:—

"I have received your Address, praying that No. 25 of the Regulations under the Old-Age Pensions Act, 1908, which have been laid before Parliament may be annulled. I shall give directions in accordance with your Address."

The LORD CHANCELLOR informed the House that he had received from the Registrar in Bankruptcy of the High Court of Justice, a certificate under the seal of the said Court, stating that the right hon. John Baron Dormer, of 8, Queensberry Place, Queen's Gate, in the county of London, being a Peer of the Realm, was adjudicated bankrupt on the 13th day of July, 1908. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kirkcaldy and Dysart Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Report of the Committee of Re-arrangement (Victoria and Albert Museum, Art Division), adopted 29th July, 1908.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4162. Persia (Khorasan).

COLONIES.

Return relating to the rates of import duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates; statistical tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates. Part XXXI., 1906.

ALIENS ACT 1905.

Return of alien passenger traffic between the United Kingdom and ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 30th September, 1908 ; together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom.

INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.

Supplementary Report of the Departmental Committee on compensation for industrial diseases. Report, minutes of evidence, and appendix.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Annual Report for the year 1907. Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Order No. 7,586, dated the 29th October, 1908, relating to animals being carried on the s.s. " Minnesota."

POST OFFICE (SAVINGS BANK).

The Post Office Savings Bank Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1908, dated 9th November, 1908.

WINTER ASSIZES (IRELAND).

Four Orders in Council, dated 3rd November, 1908, for holding winter assizes in Ireland.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Rule in substitution of Rule 14 of the Rules made by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, sealed on the 17th June, 1908.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Rules made by the Board of Trade, CXIII.—CXXVI. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ADMISSION OF THE PRESS) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of the Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received on Tuesday next.

NURSES REGISTRATION BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS : My Lords, I am not going to make a speech, but before this Bill leaves your Lordships' House, I wish to say a few words concerning it. I do so because two days ago I received a letter from a nurse in one of the London hospitals, who is the daughter of an old respected tenant of mine, and who, on the death of her father, took to nursing as a profession, in which letter she expressed the hope that I would resist this Bill. I thereupon put three questions to her. The first was whether the whole of the staff of the hospital where she was employed—the London Hospital—were of her opinion. To that question she replied in the affirmative. I then asked whether the nurses in the other hospitals shared that view, and she replied that, with the exception of two hospitals, the whole nursing staff in London were opposed to the Bill. In my last question I asked for the reason. The reason she gave was this. That when once a nurse's name was on this register, though she might not be of high character, nothing but a crime could lead to her removal; and she asked me to read an article in this journal, *The Hospital*, which really confirms her own view, and the substance of which is that a person who is not at all fit for nursing may pass the examination, whereas a nurse who is in every way suitable may fail to pass. This lady also mentioned that Miss Nightingale is deadly opposed to State registration. I have great respect for the opinion of my noble friend who has shown great ability in carrying this Bill through its various stages, but in a matter of this kind I prefer to take my position alongside Miss Nightingale rather than with my noble friend. Therefore, if any Member of your Lordships' House moves the rejection of this Bill, I shall certainly vote with him. I shall not, however, take upon myself to move its rejection, but I have thought it right that your Lordships should know the opinion of nurses generally with reference to this Bill.

*Lord KINNAIRD: My Lords, I am sure it is the wish of every Member of your Lordships' House that consideration should be shown to ladies engaged in this honourable and useful profession, and that nothing should be done by this Bill to injure their position. It is however necessary that the interests of the public should be more adequately protected than the Bill at present does. I therefore venture to hope that when the Bill goes down to the other House it will be carefully considered there, so as to secure that unfit nurses are not allowed to continue to hold a certificate of efficiency.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: My Lords, I desire before we part from this Bill to say a few words in regard to it. I have not taken much part in the discussion of the Bill during any of its stages, but your Lordships may remember that earlier in the session, I made myself responsible for another Bill, which, on a division, did not meet with your Lordships' favour. I still think, though I am not going to re-argue the matter, that the policy foreshadowed in that Bill was wiser, both in the interests of the nursing profession and in the interests of the general public, than the proposal contained in this Bill; and if I could look into the heart of the Privy Council, I am confident I should find that, although they have taken a not altogether unfriendly interest in this Bill, the Privy Council—at any rate, the noble Lord who was Lord President of the Council at the time when the Bill for which I was responsible was before the House—largely share the opinion which I have just expressed.

This Bill has certainly been considerably amended, largely at the instance of the Privy Council, during its passage through your Lordships' House. It has been, I frankly say, a good deal improved; but I think it has been improved almost out of recognition as compared with what was contained in it when first presented to your Lordships' notice. I venture to say that very seldom has any Bill upon a topic which is largely uncontroversial been so altered as this Bill has been. But even now I am afraid that it is more likely to do mischief than to do good. I do not propose to divide the House against the Third Reading, having regard to the course which has been taken by the noble Viscount who represents the Privy Council in amending it as he has done; but I venture to say, with some confidence, that the apparent guarantee which is given in this Bill by registration will be found in practice to be largely a delusive guarantee, and will not effect the intentions—the laudable intentions, to some extent—of those who are promoting it.

Now, my Lords, what does this Bill do? It proposes to have a register of nurses, and it appoints a council for the purpose of keeping that register. Practically everything else in the Bill is machinery. Taking, then, the fact that there is to be a public register of nurses kept by an authority largely under the guidance of the Privy Council as the central fact of the Bill, what will it, in practice, effect? It will only tell the public that upon that register such and such nurses' names appear, that those who are upon the register have undergone a certain minimum of training in their profession, and that they have passed a certain examination. There will be, by the fact that their names remain upon the register, not the slightest continuing guarantee that their efficiency is maintained. There is no sort of guarantee really given. Yet what many of those who think with me feel about the proposal is this, that the public will be deluded into believing that, because a particular nurse's name is on this register, therefore the State is guaranteeing the efficiency of that lady for the honourable and noble profession which she intends to pursue.

It surely is perfectly obvious that many of the qualifications most required in a nurse are just those which cannot be tested by any form of examination, whether qualifying, competitive, or otherwise. The examination is a test of knowledge, and it is a delusion to say that there is any analogy between the profession of nursing, and that of either the medical profession or the calling of midwives. In both the medical profession and the profession of midwifery it would be idle, of course, to deny that personal qualifications and personal adaptabilities are not of the first importance. In both those professions there must be, for the public safety, a certain modicum of actual professional training and skill;

but no one, I think, who knows the circumstances can deny that, as compared with them, the profession of nursing is one in which personal characteristics, adaptability, and suitability of the individual—just those qualifications which cannot be tested by examination—are of the first and the highest importance. Registration will certainly prove that the nurse has passed a certain technical examination, but it will not give the slightest clue to her character, her adaptability for all the requirements of the sick room, and her capacity for working with others with whom she may be called upon to work; and many of the evils which are now alleged will be only too liable to go on unchecked, because, although for certain professional misconduct there is a power to strike a name off the register, I think it is perfectly obvious to those who know what human nature is, that, except in cases of almost notorious misconduct, people will prefer not to make the complaint and certainly not to go through all the difficulties and obloquy involved in having any woman's name struck off the register. Therefore it seems to me that on that ground, even if it stood alone, the supposed guarantee given by this Bill will not be effective.

Taking the other line, the examination guarantees probably certain efficiency at the time of passing the examination, but will the efficiency be continued? Supposing a woman passes an examination now in nursing qualifications, her name will be placed permanently upon the register; but what will be the guarantee that is given of efficiency twenty, twenty-five, or thirty years hence? Yet, however much, either from advancing age or any other cause, a nurse has deteriorated there will be no power on those grounds to remove her name from the register. I cannot speak from personal knowledge in this matter, but I am told that even if a nurse was hardly sensible and hardly able to look after herself, it would not be under this Bill considered sufficient ground for striking her off the register, nor would there be any power to do so. It seems to me that far the wiser course would be to give the public the means of protecting themselves, by providing for a register in which the full qualifications and training of nurses should be set out. There is no obligation in this Bill, so far as I can see, to give more than the mere fact that such and such a lady has had a certain amount of professional training and passed a certain examination.

That is all I have to say as regards the main part of the Bill. I hope it will be carefully scrutinised in another place. I believe that there is much field still for inquiry in regard to the whole matter. I ventured during the Committee Stage of the Bill to allude to the power given to a certain body known as the Matrons' Council in the bringing into operation of this proposed measure. I understood the noble Lord who is responsible for the Bill to say that there were some 200 persons upon that council. The noble Viscount the Lord President undertook to make inquiry in regard to that matter; he has most courteously supplied me with a certain amount of information, and the accounts of the Matrons' Council were sent to me in print. If I read them rightly, the income from subscriptions is something like £30. I may be wrong, but that is how I read the accounts. The annual subscription for membership of the body is, I understand, 5s. Therefore this does not work out to anything like 200 Members. I understand that some further information has been supplied to the Lord President of the Council; but the suggestion I make—and I make it in all seriousness and earnestness—is that, if not in this House, at any rate before the measure passes the other House of Parliament, the fullest public information should be given as to the constitution of this Matrons' Council, where the members come from, of what hospitals they are matrons, how long they have been members of the council, what guarantee they have shown of their interest in the matter, and how far, in fact, it is a body which ought to be trusted with the great powers given to it under this Bill. As I have said, I do not propose to divide the House on the Third Reading. I think that, upon the whole, the course recommended, as I understand, by His Majesty's Government, that the Bill should be allowed to pass, is probably the wisest in the circumstances in which we are placed; but I am personally far from satisfied that the Bill has not in it the seeds of at least as much mischief as it has promise of good.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, the noble Lord in charge of this Bill will, I presume, say something to the House before the Motion for the Third Reading is put. Possibly the noble Viscount the Lord President of the Council may desire to say something too. If so, there is a point upon which I at least greatly desire further information. This Bill deals with a matter as to which we must rely to a certain extent on the evidence of experts; it is obviously not a matter on which we can speak first-hand with real authority and full knowledge.

When this proposal was first made a number of years ago, lists of names were produced of those in favour of and those against the proposal. Those lists were closely scanned, I have no doubt, by many of your Lordships, certainly by me, and never in my life have I, in comparing two lists, felt more markedly the contrast between those names which should weigh and those which merely count numerically. The weight of authority put forward against the measure as it then was, first of great leading physicians and also of matrons of practically nearly all the hospitals and nursing institutions in London and of a large number in the provinces as well, seemed to me to outweigh the mere numerical statistics put forward as to the number of ladies, all unknown to fame although no doubt most excellent, who thought the passing of such a Bill desirable.

We were told that in some points the Bill would be modified, and it has been modified to a very large extent. Will the noble Lord in charge of the Bill tell us whether the eminent physicians and the matrons to whom I have referred have changed their opinion in consequence of the modifications made, and are now prepared to support the Bill? If they have, I shall be ready to bow to such a decision, but I have seen no evidence in the public prints to show that they have changed their opinion. Failing that, one has to fall back upon such private information as one can get; and from the inquiries I have made I find no evidence of such a change. I have no hesitation in saying that anyone who will examine and weigh the names of those who stand on the two sides will come to the conclusion that we are somewhat precipitate if we go ahead in a matter of this kind in the teeth of such counsel. I have no wish to obstruct the Bill unnecessarily, but if the information for which I have asked is not forthcoming now I hope it will be forthcoming in another place before the Bill becomes law.

*LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, I had hoped that a Bill which had passed through all its stages in your Lordships' House without a division, in spite of the fact that it had been twice in Committee and that considerable Amendments had been introduced, would have been allowed a Third Reading without further criticism or comment, and that it would not have been necessary for me to take up your Lordships' time by once more recalling the circumstances in which this Bill has been introduced, and reminding the House of the support which has for twenty years past been given to the movement in favour of State registration. I confess that I am extremely astonished at the nature of the criticisms just made by the three noble Lords who have spoken, and most particularly by those which fell from the most rev. Primate. I think I can trace the origin of them all. Those attacks were all inspired from the same source; but that is a personal matter which I will leave alone.

Let me, in the first place, deal with the very astonishing comments which have been made by the most rev. Primate. He said in the first instance, that he desired the evidence of experts, and, secondly, he asked your Lordships to believe that those in favour of the Bill could only show mere numerical superiority, whereas those opposed to it could bring forward a list of weighty and eminent names. I cannot for the life of me conceive where the most rev. Primate has obtained his information. I can only suppose that he has thrown into his waste-paper basket the numerous printed papers and other sources of information which have been sent to him and to other Members of your Lordships' House. In the circumstances, and as the most rev. Primate has challenged me to give him the information, I am obliged to detain your Lordships by going once more over old ground.

This movement, as I said just now, started some twenty years ago, and during the whole of the intervening period it has obtained a steadily increasing measure of support. If there had been any opposition to the movement which was reasonable and strong, surely that opposition would have organised itself in that time; but the contrary is the case. There is absolutely no organised opposition to the Bill. On the other hand, we can show that practically all the nurses who have any sort of organisation for the benefit of their profession and for the promotion of their mutual interests are in favour of the principle of State registration. I will give chapter and verse. Its supporters include the Asylum Workers' Association, with 3,000 members; the Society for State Registration, with 2,360 members; the Royal British Nurses' Association, with 2,000 members; the Matrons' Council, with about 200 members; the Irish Matrons' Association, with 40 members; the Irish Nurses' Association, with 450 members; and twelve separate leagues of nurses, with a membership numbering 1,700. If that is not expert opinion, I do not know what is. Certain it is that no organised body of nurses has taken steps to oppose the Bill. I should also add that, though nurses are not organised in Scotland, the Scottish Registration Committee is strongly in favour of the Bill.

Then we have the support of, I will not say the overwhelming majority, but of a very large and striking preponderance of opinion in the medical profession. The General Medical Council, the governing body of the medical profession, pronounced unreservedly in favour of the principle of State registration in 1889. The British Medical Association, which numbers 21,000 medical practitioners throughout the country, voted decidedly in favour of the principle on three occasions—in 1895, in 1904, and in 1906; in 1906 they carried a resolution in favour by a vote of ninety out of ninety-three, which is about as near unanimity as you can possibly get, and that was not a casual vote, but a vote of delegates from constituencies which had considered this question for two years. You could hardly have a more deliberate and decided opinion from any body than that given by the medical profession.

A number of other representative institutions interested in the subject in various ways, such as the National Union of Women Workers and the Women's Industrial Council, have expressed similar opinions, and I should be very much surprised if those bodies had not sent their representations to the most rev. Primate, just as they have done to other Members of this House and to myself. Further, the question was considered in two sessions by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, who heard all expert witnesses who were willing to come forward. You cannot go further than that. Noble Lords have asked that there should be further inquiry, and have suggested, in a manner which I cannot regard as quite ingenuous, that this Bill has been rushed upon the House and that there has not been full inquiry. I do not know what more you can do than have a Select Committee which hears all the evidence. That Select Committee pronounced in favour of registration, and in favour of the particular Bill of which I have the honour to have charge.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: Will the noble Lord say whether the Bill was before the Committee?

*LORD AMPTHILL: The Bill was before the Committee.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: This particular Bill?

*LORD AMPTHILL: Yes. Two Bills were before the Committee, and this was one of them. If your Lordships wish for further evidence of the opinion that exists, you have only to look to the immense commotion which took place in Ireland when His Majesty's Government decided temporarily to exclude Ireland from the Bill. Meetings were held in every prominent centre in Ireland, and the most eminent people connected with that country wrote letters of sympathy if they were not able to attend.

There is opposition, and I will not copy the example of that opposition by using the *argumentum ad hominem*, by scoffing at and deriding the *personnel* of the movement. I will merely refer to their objections. They were stated at greater length than by other speakers by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and his first argument was the worm-eaten one that you cannot register character. That has become a sort of catchword amongst the opponents of registration, and they seem to think it satisfies every requirement of reason or logic. The answer is that we do not propose to register character. What we propose to register is proficiency, and we say that you can register proficiency amongst nurses just as you register proficiency in many other important professions. The noble Lord said that even if you record that a nurse has passed an examination and attained a certain standard, that proficiency might be lost. I think it is hardly necessary to argue in your Lordships' House that technical skill, manual dexterity, and trained powers of observation once acquired are not lost. A nurse who had once attained proficiency after three years training would not become professionally unsafe except from physical disability or moral deterioration. The former is easily ascertained by those engaging a nurse, whilst the latter would be dealt with by the nursing council who would have power to remove from the register any nurse unfit to be upon it. We do not expect lawyers to read up every new law that is passed, and yet they are not considered to deteriorate in proficiency. Nobody, again, expects a doctor to keep abreast of all the rapidly increasing improvements and advances in modern science, and yet when once upon the register he is considered fully qualified. The familiar instances of swimming, riding, skating, shooting, and other exercises of skill, show that proficiency once attained is generally retained for long years even when the art is not practised.

But there is another advantage in registration which those who oppose it seek to obscure by loose reasoning. The value of any professional register is dependent not on the fact of registration, but on the supervision of training, the enforcement of national standards, and the maintenance of discipline. I am quite aware that a considerable number of London hospital managers do not care for what they consider State interference. That attitude was reflected by the noble Earl who opened the discussion. That attitude is perfectly intelligible; but you might just as well have stayed the whole course of reform in factory legislation because there were a few model employers who thought, perhaps with right and reason, that they could do better for their workmen if they were left to themselves. But legislation, surely, must be for the imperfect general mass, not for the perfect few. I offer that to the noble Lord as a gentle retort to the arguments which he used against me.

The noble Lord said that the Bill was improved out of all recognition. I cannot agree. No essential principle in the Bill has been changed in the smallest degree. The drafting has been improved, and for that I owe grateful thanks to His Majesty's Government and to the Department of the Privy Council. Large Departments of State have been safeguarded. I refer, of course, to the sick berths of the Navy, and to the nursing department of the Army. Amendments for that purpose have been introduced, but otherwise the changes have been merely in the direction of improving and simplifying the machinery which the Bill is to set up. The noble Marquess who sits below me expressed himself on a previous occasion as opposed to the Bill. He declared that what really needed remedying were the scandals in nursing homes, of which he admitted the existence to a very serious degree. I should like to take this opportunity of assuring the noble Marquess that that is one of the principal objects of the Bill. The mere creation of a standard is in itself the only means of removing scandals. A nursing home with nefarious designs will no longer be able to engage nurses who have no proper qualification when once the public are able to ascertain for themselves whether or not a nurse has attained to the recognised degree of proficiency.

The noble Lord on the cross benches, Lord Kinnaird, is, I think, anxious on behalf of cottage nurses, and I think that some other noble Lords have shared his anxiety. I should like to remind the House that cottage nurses, as apart from trained district nurses, are almost always midwives, and that as such they are registered under the Midwives Act and hold their certificates. Surely it is fair and reasonable to do for nurses what has already been done by legislation for midwives. I have some practical experience of the administration of the Midwives Act, with which I have to deal in my own county, and I can assure your Lordships that there can be no doubt whatever of the benefits which that Act has conferred. There is a most marked and visible improvement in the methods of the midwives and in their desire to comply with the law and to become more proficient; and the survivors of the system which is now obsolete are fast making way for a new and more efficient class of midwives. I believe there is a movement for extending the Midwives Act to Ireland, which is in itself proof that the registration of midwives is valued in practice.

The noble Earl who opened the discussion asked your Lordships to consider that the opinion of Miss Florence Nightingale outweighed all the professional and expert opinion which I have quoted in support of the Bill. Although I yield to nobody in admiration of Miss Nightingale as a great and patriotic woman, to whom we owe the whole foundation of the system of nursing, I cannot take quite that view of the influence of her opinion. Miss Nightingale must be getting on in years, and it is hardly credible that she should have been able to keep up with the present movement. Again, the noble Earl was in error in regard to the provisions of the Bill. He admitted that he had received his information from the London Hospital, when he stated that the only cause for removal would be crime. I must call the noble Earl's attention to Clause 10, subsection (6), of the Bill, which provides that the council "shall have power to decide upon the suspension or removal from the register of the name of any nurse for any breach of the rules and regulations from time to time laid down under this Act by the Council, or for conduct disgraceful in a professional respect." I must say I should have thought that the noble Earl, before using the undoubted weight of his influence to criticise this measure, would have at least taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the Bill, and would not have based his opinions, as he admittedly did, on the word of one single nurse from one single hospital.

Again, I believe the noble Earl has been entirely misinformed in regard to his statement that all the nurses in the London hospitals are against the Bill. I have very good evidence that there are many nurses in the hospitals of London, and even in the London Hospital, who are in favour of State registration; but they dare not say so, because it would be as much as their situations were worth. In conclusion, I cannot omit to mention the debt of gratitude which I owe to His Majesty's Government for the sympathetic consideration they have given to the Bill and for the valuable assistance they have rendered in amending it in such a manner as to suit the requirements of the various Government Departments. And perhaps I may also be permitted to thank your Lordships for the interest you have taken in the Bill, to which I trust you will now be good enough to accord a Third Reading.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I might explain that what I said with regard to Miss Nightingale was that on a question of nursing I would prefer to take her opinion to that of my noble friend; and, as regards the opinion of nurses generally, the information given to me was that, with the exception of two hospitals, all the nursing staffs in London were opposed to my noble friend's Bill.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, as it happens, I was concerned with this question before my noble friend behind me (Viscount Wolverhampton), and therefore I rise to say a word upon the Third Reading of this Bill. The noble Lord who has just sat down has made a very clear and able defence of his measure, and if he put its claims somewhat higher than the facts actually warrant, after all that is only what most of us do when we are in charge of Bills, and we sometimes credit them with having more effect than they will have in practice.

Whatever may be the merits of this measure, I do not think it will create a revolution either in or out of the nursing world. The main criticism which has been levelled at it was fairly expressed to-night in the speech of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and on one point I confess I find myself, as I have already often stated from this place, in some degree of agreement with him. I have always held the opinion that, unless some means could be found for establishing a continuing guarantee of proficiency, registration must lose a great part of its value; and I do not think that the noble Lord who has just sat down really answered the point that was made by my noble friend opposite, and has been made by others to the effect that, after all, unless you can secure this continuing guarantee your register, so far as that part of it is concerned, does not very materially differ from the directory proposed by Lord Balfour—that is to say, it does not do much more than give the actual statement that a particular kind of training has been received by a particular woman a certain number of years ago. That, of course, is a serious criticism, and it is one with which I confess that I myself in some measure agree. And what also brings home to my mind the unreality of the whole business is that I do not think that if noble Lords are unfortunately obliged to call in the services of a nurse for themselves or their families—and I take noble Lords merely as an example—they will even inquire whether the nurse is on the register or not. I am sure that if I had occasion to call in the services of a nurse, I should get one, of course, through the recommendation of a doctor or from a hospital, but I should not inquire whether or not the lady's name was on the register.

But there are considerations on the other side which have been stated very fairly by the noble Lord in charge of the Bill. In the first place, we must remember that a Select Committee of the House of Commons did give a very decided opinion in favour of a system of registration, and although we do not always follow the advice of Select Committees, yet that is a material fact quite apart from the weight of evidence which was brought before that Committee. In the second place, I do not think it can be disputed that, at any rate, so far as numbers are concerned, a very considerable majority of the nursing profession do ask for a register; and although I should not be prepared to say the same as regards the medical profession, I have no doubt there is a considerable weight of opinion in the medical profession on the side of the noble Lord. Then, in the third place, it is only fair to mention that the noble Lord has considerably modified his Bill, at the instance, I think, very largely of my noble friend's Department, in a manner which removes some of the objections taken to it by its opponents. The principal change, to my mind, is that the Bill is not now a Bill to register the whole nursing profession and in any way to treat being or not being on the register as a test of efficiency; as the Bill now stands, the register is there for those who choose to take it, but there is no sort of imputation upon those who do not choose to join. That is a marked and material difference, which I think ought to be borne in mind. Under these circumstances I think that a balance of advantage undoubtedly exists in favour of the Bill, and consequently His Majesty's Government are fully prepared to support the Third Reading.

On Question, Bill read 3^a and passed, and sent to the Commons.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for resuming the debate on the Second Reading read, and discharged.

DECK CARGOES.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords I rise to ask whether British merchant vessels commonly leave ports in the United Kingdom in the winter time carrying deck-cargoes in the form of boilers, cylinders, railway wagons, and other heavy and cumbersome material; whether the Board of Trade have any regulations or adopt any special precautions in regard to such cargoes; and also to move for a Return from the Board of Trade showing the number of vessels which have carried these deck-cargoes from ports in the United Kingdom, and giving particulars of accidents which have arisen out of them during the past five winter seasons.

I am given to understand from those who know best—that is, those who have had practical experience in the matter—that many of our merchant ships leave home ports in the winter-time in a dangerous condition owing to deck-cargoes of the nature indicated in my notice. As your Lordships know, we legislate against British ships bringing dangerous deck-loads of timber into the United Kingdom during the winter time. Therefore, it seems to me somewhat of an anomaly, and a dangerous anomaly at that, that British ships can carry dangerous deck-loads out of the United Kingdom with perfect impunity. I am told that even in the case of large passenger steamers — particularly in the Eastern trades—these deck-loads are of quite usual occurrence. I am not opposed to reason in this matter, but it seems to me that it is one necessitating inquiry and careful consideration, particularly as I am informed that there have been some narrow escapes through deck cargoes getting adrift in bad weather and causing serious structural damage, which might result in the total loss of a ship with her crew, and also her passengers, did she carry any. I should be glad to hear that the Board of Trade are prepared to grant the Return for which I am moving, for then we should be able to go further into the matter and ascertain whether it was necessary or desirable to deal with it by legislation or otherwise.

Moved, for a Return showing the number of vessels which have carried deck-cargoes from ports in the United Kingdom, and giving particulars of accidents which have arisen out of them during the past five winter seasons.—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, the noble Lord has really asked three questions, and it would, perhaps, be better that I should give a categorical answer to each. In the first place, he asks whether British merchant vessels commonly leave ports in the United Kingdom in the winter time carrying deck-cargoes in the form of boilers, cylinders, railway wagons, and other heavy and cumbersome material. In answer to that, I have to say that such cargoes are frequently carried, and as long as they are properly stowed and properly secured there does not seem to be any reason for interfering with the practice. It is obvious that there are certain large pieces of machinery which it is difficult to get into the hold of a ship, and, providing that proper precautions are taken, no objection is seen to the practice. Then the noble Lord asks whether the Board of Trade have any regulations, or adopt any special precautions in regard to such cargoes. In reply I have to say that there are no detailed regulations, but the Board of Trade surveyors have a general power to detain any ship which is improperly loaded. Any ship with a deck-cargo considered to be dangerous would be detained, and I have here a record of a case which occurred as lately as the 14th of last month at Glasgow, where a ship was so detained, until the cargo was re-stowed to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade Surveyor. Then the noble Lord moves for a Return showing the number of vessels which have carried these deck-cargoes from ports in the United Kingdom. I do not think that it would be possible to furnish a Return of that sort, because no records exist as to whether the ships carried a deck-cargo or not. Therefore I am afraid there are no materials from which such a Return could be compiled. As to giving particulars of accidents which have arisen out of the carrying of deck-cargoes, there we are very much in the region of conjecture. If a ship is lost with all hands it is very difficult to say exactly the reason. It would be possible, of course, to compile a Return, though that would entail an enormous amount of labour, but it would be impossible to make such a Return complete because there are not the particulars to go upon in every case. I therefore hope the noble Lord will not press for the Return, but will be content with the practice which has been followed for some time of leaving this matter in the hands of the Board of Trade surveyors, who act very conscientiously, and, I think, without fear or favour, and who are invariably supported by the Board of Trade if they think it necessary to detain a vessel.

LORD MUSKERRY: After what the noble Lord has said, I will not press my Motion, but I would like to remind him that my information comes from the men who have been in these ships at sea. That is very different from seeing the ships in dock. There can be no doubt that the carrying of these deck-cargoes is extremely dangerous.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: If the noble Lord could give the Board of Trade any instance where dangerous cargoes have been carried, I am sure the information would be most gratefully received and promptly acted upon.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MERCHANT SHIPS AND WAR INSTRUCTIONS.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether official notices have been issued to the effect that, in the event of war, certain instructions will be placed in the hands of captains of British merchant ships, and, if so, what form will these instructions take; also, to ask whether the Admiralty have invited captains of British merchant ships to supply information concerning the movements and doings of vessels belonging to foreign maritime powers; and, if so, whether the Admiralty will supply information as to the text of the communication containing this invitation.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: No official notices of the character referred to have been issued by the Admiralty, and the Admiralty at present have no intention of issuing notices of the type suggested by my noble friend.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 10th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petition from Raunds, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Govan; London; and Wellington; to lie upon the Table.

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS.

Petition from Newton Abbott, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sentence for Stealing Fowls at Enfield.

MR. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the sentence passed by Sir Ralph Littler upon a man at Enfield, viz., four years penal servitude for stealing a few fowls; and will he consider if it is possible to reduce this sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have inquired into the circumstances of this case. The prisoner pleaded guilty to stealing seven fowls of the value of over £1. He has several previous convictions for larceny, and I am informed that when he was last released from prison (in February, 1908) the police not merely found him employment, but lent him money to buy clothes to take up to the situation found for him, which he might have kept if he had chosen. The value of the goods stolen in the case for which the prisoner was indicted is no adequate measure either of the criminality of the offence, or the appropriate amount of punishment. The prisoner has not exercised his right of appealing to the Court of Criminal Appeal against the sentence, and, having regard to his conduct and record, I am satisfied that a reduction of the sentence passed by the Court would not be in the public interest.

Foreign Speaking Crew of s.s. "Zeeland."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the British Steamer "Zeeland" recently engaged forty firemen and trimmers at the port of Antwerp, and that the majority were unable to speak or understand the English language; whether he is aware that these firemen and trimmers were supplied by an Antwerp shipping master, who charged fees to the so-called firemen and trimmers for obtaining them employment; whether he is aware of the number of English-speaking firemen and trimmers in Antwerp; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made as to why a preference was given to foreigners who could not speak or understand the English language.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am informed that the s.s. "Zeeland" engages thirty firemen and twenty-seven trimmers at Antwerp every trip, and I am assured that there is no reason to suppose that they do not understand English. I have ascertained that the firemen and trimmers were not supplied by, or any fees paid to, an Antwerp shipping master, but were selected at the company's office. I am unable to state the number of English-speaking firemen and trimmers in Antwerp, but British subjects seeking employment at sea are scarce at that port. So far from any preference being given to foreigners who cannot speak or understand English, the Consul General reports that preference is given to seamen of British nationality.

Beer Ingredients.

SIR JOHN BARKER (Penryn and Falmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the Inland Revenue Departments can furnish a complete list of all the articles which have come under their notice as being used in the manufacture or preservation of beer other than malt, hops, sugar, yeast, or water.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The following articles, other than malt, hops, sugar, yeast, and water, have come under the notice of the Inland Revenue Departments as being occasionally used in the manufacture or preservation of beer: Rice, flaked rice, rice grits, rice malt, geletanised rice; maize, flaked maize, maize grits, maize flour; oats, flaked, rolled, malted, and crushed; torrefied barley. Yeast foods: these include solid and liquid preparation of peptonised yeast sold under various trade names, as nutramide, peptomide, dalline, etc., mixtures of malt flour and alkaline phosphates, common salt, etc., and preparations of malt combings, etc. Preservatives: mainly sulphites of soda and potash, and sold under various trade names, *e.g.*, kalium metasulphite (K.M.S.), sulphosite, etc. Salicylic and boracic acids are also occasionally used as preservatives. "Burtonisers" (substances used for hardening brewing waters) are chiefly sulphates and chlorides of calcium and magnesium. Neutralisers: mainly carbonates of potash and soda and sold under various trade names, as regenerator, acid neutraliser, antacid, etc. Hop substitutes: catechu or cutch, Tannin, Extrait de houblons d'Alsace, Davis' hop substitute, optanin, quassia and preparations containing quassia. Preparations used to precipitate albuminous matters from wort, mainly gelatine, Iceland moss, Irish moss, alginol, ibrite, etc. Miscellaneous brewing materials: albumen maltose, linseed, liquorice, amide syrup (ceramide), dextrin.

Bonus Distributed Under the Land Purchase Act.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total amount of the bonus actually distributed under the Land Purchase Act, and the amount in each of the four provinces of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the amount of the bonus actually distributed under Section 48 (1) of the Irish Land Act, 1903, up to 31st October last was £2,536,217. To ascertain the amount paid in respect of each province would involve an examination of some 2,500 accounts, and would impose an undue amount of labour on the Commissioners' staff, who are already fully occupied.

Advances Under the Land Purchase Act.

MR. HAYDEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount actually advanced by way of loan and bonus under the Land Purchase Act of 1903, and the amount advanced under previous Acts, for the purchase of land by occupiers in Ireland; and if he is yet in a position to give the amount involved in the agreements lodged under the Act of 1903 up to the end of October in the present year, and the amount of the same lodged during the month of October.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the amount advanced under the Land Purchase Acts, 1870 to 1896, was £23,886,392. The amount advanced under the Irish Land Act, 1903, up to 31st October last was £25,331,240, and the amount of bonus actually distributed up to the same date was £2,536,217. The Commissioners are not yet in a position to give the total amount involved in agreements lodged under the Act of 1903 up to 31st October.

British Subjects in Egypt.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, having regard to the fact that many British subjects now own land in Egypt, he will say whether the testamentary dispositions of British subjects are governed by Ottoman or British law.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) If the Question is meant to refer to the testamentary dispositions of British subjects relating to land in Egypt, the Answer is that at present the Ottoman law is applied.

Family Deported from Canada on Account of Poverty.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can say under what agency was the family, recently brought under his notice, sent out to Canada which has since been deported on account of poverty.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I understand from the report given in the Press that the man referred to by my hon. friend was originally sent to Canada by the West Ham Guardians.

Pay and Prospects of Assistant Clerks.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state when a reply will be given to the Memorial concerning the better pay and prospects of assistant clerks, having regard to previous questions on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The matter is still under consideration, but I hope to be able to arrive at a decision before long.

Pay of Labourers and Gardeners Employed by Dublin Board of Works.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the rates of pay current in the City of Dublin for skilled and unskilled labour, it is proposed to increase the wages of the labourers and gardeners in the employment of the Board of Works in the public parks and gardens of Dublin; and whether he will make inquiry as to the rates of wages paid to persons similarly employed by the Dublin Corporation.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have nothing to add to the Answers which I have given to previous Questions on this point.

Civil Service Superannuation.

COLONEL IVOR PHILIPPS (Southampton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when it is proposed to introduce the Bill to amend the law as to superannuation in the Civil Service.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I beg to refer my hon. and gallant friend to the reply given by the Prime Minister to a similar Question on the 6th instant.

Unofficial Work by Ordnance Survey Staff.

MR. FIELD: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that members of the Civil staff of the Ordnance Survey at Dublin have been doing surveying and draughtsmen's work for private persons and receiving pay for the same while in the public service; whether permission has been granted to perform this class of work, and, if so, to how many; and whether it is proposed to allow public servants to monopolise work of this class and deprive private surveyors of it.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The work to which my hon. friend refers is not done during official hours nor in contravention of the Treasury Regulations governing the undertaking of unofficial employment by members of the Civil Service. With a view, however, of preventing any possibility of the work in question conflicting with official duties, permission has to be obtained for doing it, and during the last three months the necessary permission has been granted in eleven cases. The President of the Board does not propose to interfere with the existing arrangements.

Taxation at Home and Abroad.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the amount of taxation per head of population in Germany, France, the United States of America, and Great Britain.

(Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. The tax revenue of the United Kingdom in the current financial year is estimated to amount to £2 17s. 5d. per head of the population. The lines of demarcation between Imperial, State, and local expenditure differ so much in different countries, and the methods of taxation are so diverse, that I am not prepared to name any figures for the other countries referred to in the Question as being comparable with that which I have given for the United Kingdom.

County Councils and Excise Duties.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, in case of a refusal by a county council to administer the clause of the Finance Act dealing with the transfer of the duties of Excise officers to officials of the county council, what would be the position of the county council in default, and would they suffer any pecuniary loss.

(Answered by Mr. John Burns.) Subject to the provisions of any agreement or award as to adjustments with another council or councils, the proceeds of the duties on the licences referred to in Section 6 of the Finance Act, 1908, form part of the revenue of the council of the county or county borough in which they are collected. Any loss of revenue due to default on the part of a council in enforcing the payment of the duties would fall upon the council.

Income-Tax Payers.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the numbers of persons paying income-tax in England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, in each of the following classes for the financial year 1907–8, viz.: on incomes exceeding £160 but not exceeding £400, exceeding £400 but not exceeding £500, exceeding £500 but not exceeding £600, exceeding £600 but not exceeding £700; what was the average rate of income-tax per pound paid in each of these four classes; and what was the total number of those paying income-tax in each of the above countries for the same financial year.

(Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.) Statistics are not yet available of the numbers of persons paying income-tax in the various classes mentioned for the financial year 1907–8, but for 1906–7 the number of abatements granted to persons with incomes exceeding £160 but not exceeding £700 were as follows—

	Incomes exceeding £160 but not exceeding £400.	Incomes exceeding £400 but not exceeding £500.	Incomes exceeding £500 but not exceeding £600.	Incomes exceeding £600 but not exceeding £700.
England and Wales -	536,830	49,979	28,240	14,258
Scotland - - -	63,388	6,037	3,584	1,688
Ireland - - - -	28,600	2,688	1,326	661

The average rate of income-tax per pound paid in each class cannot be stated, and there is no information derivable from income-tax statistics as to the numbers of income-tax payers in each of the countries forming the United Kingdom.

Prohibition of Hop Substitutes.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when he proposes to introduce the promised Bill to prohibit the use of hop substitutes and to require the marking of imported foreign hops.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I cannot give a definite date for the introduction of the Bill, but I hope to be able to bring it in shortly.

Hop Industry.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when the Government Bill based on the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Hop Industry will be introduced.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I hope shortly to be able to bring in a Bill prohibiting the use of hops substitutes in beer and providing for the marking of hops imported from abroad, but I cannot give a definite date for its introduction.

Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland).

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland are paid for their services; whether he will consider the advisability of superseding any Commissioner who has not attended any meeting of that body for twelve months; and whether he will give the names of all the present officers of the Commissioners, stating, with reference to each, the name of the person on whose recommendation he was appointed, date of appointment, salary then and now, and the source from which paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests are unpaid, and I am not aware of any foundation for the suggestion that they are negligent in their attendance. The names and length of service of the present officers of the Commissioners are given in the Government Department (Ireland) Return (H. C. Paper, No. 8, of 1907), but there is no means of ascertaining on whose recommendation they were appointed. Their salaries appear in the Civil Service Estimates.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has noticed that the last Report of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland does not specify the year with which it deals, does not state the value of property acquired by the Commissioners in 1867, received each year since then or held now, or the exact amount dealt with in the last or any other year, does not embody any regular statement of account, and does not indicate that the local accounts have been vouched or the Commissioners' accounts audited as required by statute; whether these defects, and the refusal to give a list of the charity properties now controlled by the Commissioners, are due to disorder, confusion, and the absence of vouchers and audit; and, if not, seeing that the property in question is supposed to be worth £1,000,000, whether he will obtain and produce the information which this Report should contain but does not.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests inform me that their last Report, as may be seen by reference thereto, deals with the period from July, 1907, to July, 1908. It contains a statement of the property now held by the Commissioners and of the sums placed under their guardianship since July, 1904. Previous Reports contain similar information for similar periods. The Report further shows that the Commissioners' charity accounts for the year 1907 have been submitted for audit. The audit is now proceeding and the audited accounts will be forwarded to the clerk of the council as required by statute. In his last Report the auditor stated that the accounts had been carefully prepared and vouched in a most satisfactory manner. The return of properties under the control of the Commissioners asked for by the hon. Member in April, 1907, was not given because, as I stated at the time, the preparation of the return would have served no public purpose commensurate with the labour involved.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the aggregate amount of property now vested in the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland and in the Commissioners of Education respectively; the approximate amount of property not vested in them but which they control; and the method by which the Commissioners satisfy themselves, in the absence of accounts vouched or audited, that the trust money is properly disbursed in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As regards the first part of the Question I would refer the hon. Member to paragraph 4 of the last Report of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests, and to the accounts appended to the last Report of the Commissioners of Education which have been presented to Parliament. All expenditure authorised by the Commissioners of Education is subject to annual audit by an auditor appointed by the Local Government Board. The charity accounts of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests are similarly audited, and the Commissioners, in all cases in which they have power so to do, require local administrators to furnish annual accounts which are examined in their Department.

Delay in Business at Rooskey Petty Sessions Court.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any magistrate residing in the Rooskey, County Roscommon, Petty Sessions District who attends the Court at Rooskey; whether the police and other persons who require the services of a magistrate have to travel seven miles from the court-house to the nearest magistrate; whether on several occasions for the last three years, there have been cases on the books for three or four months which could not be disposed of for want of a magistrate with the resident magistrate; whether the resident magistrate resides twenty-five miles from Rooskey; and whether the Lord Chancellor will appoint a magistrate for Rooskey.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that cases for hearing at Rooskey Petty Sessions have frequently had to be adjourned for the attendance of a second justice, the nearest magistrate who attends the Petty Sessions living five miles away. I understand that the Lord Chancellor is taking steps to appoint a new magistrate for the district.

Inquiry into Affray at Riverstown.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant a public inquiry into the fatal affray at Riverstown, the inquiry to be held on oath and civilian witnesses to be protected and indemnified against prosecution beforehand, so that the inquiry shall not be one-sided.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Pay and Pensions of Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that discontent exists among members of the Royal Irish Constabulary in consequence of the failure of the Government to deal legislatively with the question of the pay and pensions of the force; and whether there is any intention to introduce proposals on this subject this session.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As stated in my reply to a Question on the subject of the Royal Irish Constabulary Bill, asked on the 9th instant by the hon. Member for South Belfast, I trust that the necessary financial Resolution will be passed by the Committee on Monday next. In that case the Bill will be introduced at the earliest possible moment and will, I hope, become law before the end of the session.

Suggested State Library in Dublin.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in view of the limitations of the existing public libraries in Dublin and the limited time during which that situated in Trinity College is accessible to persons not belonging to that college, whether he has considered the desirability of founding a new State library in Dublin, corresponding to that in the

British Museum, and transferring to it all the books belonging to the State now in the Trinity College library, together with the privilege now enjoyed by that college of receiving free copies of all new books published in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In addition to the National Library, which is maintained by the State, I understand that Dublin is well supplied with libraries. A new State library would be superfluous, and the privilege referred to in the Question could not be transferred without legislation.

Irish Land Legislation.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, seeing that no body of ratepayers has asked for the enactment of the Tuberculosis Bill, while all classes in Ireland desire the enactment of an adequate Land Bill, and that persisting so late in the Session with one may endanger the other, whether he will consider the advisability of dropping the Tuberculosis Bill in favour of the promised Land Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have received many Resolutions from local authorities and other representative bodies in favour of the Tuberculosis Prevention Bill. It is not proposed to drop the Bill.

Payment of Irish Teachers' Fees.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that certain national school teachers in Ireland have not yet been paid fees due to them for teaching mathematics for the year ended 30th June last; how soon will those fees be paid; and, notwithstanding that the payments vary, would it not be possible for the Commissioners of National Education with the aid of calculated tables, to have all moneys due to teachers paid to them with reasonable promptitude.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the payment of fees for the teaching of mathematics as an extra branch during the year in question has been somewhat retarded owing to departmental correspondence as to the provision of the necessary funds. The fees are now in process of payment and every effort will be made to expedite the work.

Relief of Irish Congested Districts.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that, notwithstanding the assurances given by himself and his predecessor in office, the Estates Commissioners continue to facilitate the creation, and to recognise the validity, of bogus tenancies in non-residential grass land which is not legally tenanted and is required for the relief of congestion and as provision for the landless in the immediate neighbourhood; whether the instruments creating the alleged tenancies in the cases of Taaffe and Ballesty on Colonel Malone's Barronstown estate, Westmeath, may now be examined on behalf of the unrelieved congests on that estate; and by what means, legislative or administrative, does he propose to reserve untenanted and non-residential grass lands for the relief of congestion and provision for the landless.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As regards the Malone estate, I would refer the hon. Member to my replies to his Questions of 17th July last and 17th December, 1906. I am not prepared to discuss the provisions of the forthcoming Land Bill pending its introduction.

Army Horses from Wales.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House what percentage of the horses used in the Army have been bred, and what proportion have been procured, in Wales during the last five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The number of horses purchased in Wales for the Army during the last five years amounts to forty-four. It is not known what percentage of these horses was bred in Wales.

South African War Medal—Application from A. A. Reynolds.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received an application from A. A. Reynolds, of Lucknow, India, for the King's South Africa medal; whether he is aware that the applicant has very high testimonials from the Army officials under whom he served; and whether, under these circumstances, he will grant the medal as desired.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The War Office has received an application from this man. As he left Bethune's Mounted Infantry on 15th November, 1900, and became a civilian clerk in the Army Service Corps, he was ineligible for the decoration granted to soldiers under Army Order 232 of 1902. The testimonials, which are accurately described as high, do not in any way render him eligible for the medal.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

German Naval Programme.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the large armoured vessels of the German 1908 programme are laid down, or in process of being laid down.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.): We have no official information on the subject.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE: Has the hon. Gentleman any information as to the accumulation of material for this work?

Dr. MACNAMARA: We have no official knowledge.

Dockyards and the Unemployed.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the extra men who are being taken on in His Majesty's dockyards in order partly to relieve the acute state of unemployment are men who at the time of being engaged were actually unemployed.

Dr. MACNAMARA: The procedure in selecting the extra men for entry in the dockyards is as follows: Preference is given to unemployed workmen who have previously served in the yards and to unemployed workmen belonging to the dockyard towns.

Army Officers Examination.

*Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the recent qualifying examination for commissions in the Army, 326 candidates presented themselves for examination, and only 113, of whom twelve had previously served in the Militia, succeeded in satisfying the examiners; whether the examination tests have been rendered more severe, and, if not, in view of the shortage of officers, what steps he proposes to take to fill the vacancies.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): The figures stated in the Question are correct, except that it is not known how many previously served in the Militia. The standard of examination was no higher than usual. There is practically no shortage of officers at the present moment sufficient to justify any special measures.

Officers Quarters at the Curragh.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what steps have been taken to carry out his undertaking to build new quarters for the officers of the Army Service Corps at the Curragh.

Mr. HALDANE: Plans have now been approved and the building will be proceeded with as soon as possible.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the huts in which these officers are now living are unfit for human habitation? Can they not be removed to some other place in view of the approach of winter?

Mr. HALDANE: The huts are being inspected.

Mr. ASHLEY: Can the officers not be properly housed in the village?

MR. HALDANE: If the hon. Member will put down that Question I will inquire.

Tropical Agriculture.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any steps are being taken to establish in England a bureau of tropical agriculture.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): It is not proposed to establish in England a bureau of tropical agriculture, but steps are being taken to appoint a committee of a representative character to advise the Secretary of State for the Colonies on agricultural matters in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates.

Government Work in Ceylon.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if all Government work in Ceylon is done locally in Government factories or through the Crown Agents, instead of being thrown open to public tender in the Colony as in India and other Colonies.

COLONEL SEELY: In Ceylon, as in most other Crown Colonies, a large proportion of the public works required by Government is carried out by the Colonial Government itself.

Colombo Graving Dock.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Ceylon Government are going to put down their own workshops in connection with the Government graving dock in Colombo; and, if so, is it contemplated that the Government workshops will undertake repairs on other than His Majesty's ships.

COLONEL SEELY: The Ceylon Government propose to transfer their Public Works Department Factory to a site near the graving dock, and to undertake work on ships using the dock, whether belonging to His Majesty or not. They have been forced to take this step by their failure, after nearly three years of negotiation, to arrive at satisfactory terms with local firms for the provision of the necessary workshops. Shipping firms using the dock will, however, be at liberty to entrust their repairs to private firms, should they desire to do so.

French Tariff Commission Report.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to when the final Report of the French Tariff Commission may be expected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The Reports of the Customs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies with regard to the proposed modification of the French Customs Tariff are now being issued, and there is every reason to suppose that the entire proposals of the Commission will be made public during the present session.

The Congo—Consul Thesiger's Report on the Kasai Region.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the recent investigations conducted by Consul Thesiger in the Kasai region of the Congo territory are completed; if a Report has been received from that Consular official; and, if so, when it will be published; and whether further Reports have been recently received from British Consuls in other parts of the Congo territory.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Mr. Thesiger's Report on his recent journey through the Kasai district has only just been received, and being of a voluminous character, some time must necessarily elapse before it has been fully considered, but when this has been done I will consider the question of issuing a Parliamentary Paper containing this and some other Reports recently received.

Belgian Colonial Minister.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is within his knowledge that the recently appointed Colonial

Minister for Belgium was formerly an administrator of the Compagnie du Chemin du Congo aux Grands Lacs, a concessionaire company, whose treatment of the natives is strongly condemned in the Report of Vice-Consul Michell, published in the White-book, Africa No. 1. (1908). [Cd. 3880]; and whether the official appointed as the chief of the Colonial Minister's staff was one of the leading officials in the Congo Free State's Brussels administration.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Monsieur Renkin, the new Colonial Minister, was at one time a director of the Grands Lacs Railway Company; he resigned this position on taking office in the Belgian Cabinet. The second part of the Question has presumably reference to Monsieur Droogman's appointment as Secretary-General. He was formerly Secretary-General for Finance in the administration of the independent State.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Have we any jurisdiction whatsoever—have we any right to make any kind of complaint as to who is nominated for this post?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not think that arises out of the Question, which I regarded as seeking for information. That information I have given without any comment.

Native Land Rights in the Congo.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Belgian Government in annexing the Congo has agreed to recognise the validity of native communal tenure in land, the right of the native population in any part of the Congo to trade in the commercial produce of the soil with merchants of all nationalities, and the right of merchants of all nationalities to acquire land for the purpose of erecting trading stations, and opening direct trade relations with the natives.

The following Question also was on the Paper—

SIR GILBERT PARKER: To ask the Prime Minister whether His Majesty's Government is able to assure the House that the British reply to the Belgian Government's despatch of 12th July last will be forwarded without delay, and that it will be in harmony with the Resolution accepted by His Majesty's Government, and unanimously voted by this House on 26th February last.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No communication has been received from the Belgian Government since the Papers communicated on 13th July last by the Belgian Minister in London, which were published in Africa No. 4 (1908). In regard to the second Question of my right hon. friend I have to say that a reply to the Papers has recently been despatched, and will be laid before the House in due course.

British Missions in the Congo.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Belgian Government have given satisfactory guarantees that the obstacles placed by the late administration of the Congo in the way of British missions obtaining sites for the prosecution of missionary effort in the Congo territory will be removed.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The question of sites in the Congo for the prosecution of missionary effort has not been lost sight of, but negotiations in regard to it have had to be suspended pending the transference of the Congo State to Belgium. It will form one of the first subjects to which the attention of the Belgian Government will be drawn.

Forced Labour in the Congo.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Belgian Government have given definite guarantees to do away with the forced collection of natural produce by the natives for the purpose of raising revenue.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No further guarantees beyond those contained in the papers already presented to Parliament have been received from the Belgian Government respecting forced labour. The subject is still under discussion with them.

Great Britain, Russia and Persia.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in the interests of the Anglo-Russian *entente*, he will consider the advisability of suggesting that the respective Governments should recall their subjects who are in the Persian service.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative. I do not think such a suggestion would be advisable.

International Naval Conference.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House what are the terms of the reference to the International Naval Conference which is to meet in London on 1st December next; and what nations will be represented at this Conference.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain and the United States have accepted the invitation of His Majesty's Government to take part in a Conference with a view to arrive at an agreement as to the principles of law to be applied by the International Prize Court, which it is hoped to set up at the Hague in accordance with the provisions of the Convention to that effect, annexed to the General Act of the Second Peace Conference of 1907.

MR. BOWLES: Do I understand that the terms of reference are not yet settled?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I quoted from the terms of invitation. There will be a draft document to form the basis of discussion, but that is not ready as yet.

Fa-ku-men Railway.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Japanese Government have withdrawn their protest against the construction by China of the Fa-ku-men railway; and, if so, on what conditions.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not received information to this effect.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Government are aware of the importance of the Poisons and Pharmacy Bill to agricultural and horticultural interests; and, if so, when do they propose to bring it forward in the House of Commons for its final stages, having regard to the fact that it has already passed the House of Lords after full investigation by a Joint Select Committee in June of this year, and to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee in their Report of 1903.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): If, as there now seems some reason to hope, the Bill can be made practically non-controversial, I think it may be possible to proceed with it during the present session.

Canadian Cattle Imports.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, with reference to the Committee appointed to inquire into the subject of the importation of Canadian cattle, how many times they have sat up to the present moment, and when they are likely to send in their Report.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): My hon. friend appears to be under some misapprehension. There is no Committee on the subject alluded to at present sitting, so far as I am aware.

Small Holdings in Gloucestershire.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has expressed unwillingness to lend money to the Gloucestershire County Council for the purposes of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1908, Clause 6, subsection (2), and Clause 49, for a term of fifty years; if so, what less term than fifty years has been specified.

I beg also to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has sanctioned any scheme made by the Gloucestershire County Council authorising them to demand a rent-charge for building grants under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1908, calculated to repay such loans and interest thereon accruing for a less term than fifty years; and, if so, what lesser term as a basis for calculating rent-charges has he sanctioned.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The answer to both of the Questions is in the negative. I do not find that I have been approached by the county council with regard to the matters referred to in them. Without knowing the circumstances of the particular case, I could not say for what period a loan would be sanctioned.

Emigration Statistics.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will furnish the House with particulars as to the number of people who have been emigrated by distress committees, the amount expended in so doing, and the amount that has been refunded by the emigrants.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The total number of persons who have been assisted to emigrate by the Central (Unemployed) Body for London and by provincial distress committees in England and Wales was, up to the end of September last, 12,053, including 8,371 dependants. The expenditure on the emigration of these persons amounted to £86,282, of which £59,069 was borne by the first-named authority. I am unable to state the total amount that has been refunded by the emigrants, except in the case of those assisted by the Central (Unemployed) Body, who up to the end of September last had received £2,681, including £644 contributed by the emigrants before they sailed.

Cyfartha Ironworks.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a communication from the Merthyr Borough Council, saying that owing to the practical closing of the Cyfartha Ironworks distress in the borough is becoming very acute, and asking for a grant from the £300,000 fund for the relief of the unemployed; and whether the grant has been made.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received a communication from the Merthyr Town Council to the effect stated, and have explained to them that payments from the grant can only be made to the distress committees set up under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, in aid of expenses under that Act. I shall no doubt hear from the distress committee in due course.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the distress committee which at one time existed was abandoned on account of the expense and that the work which it did is now being done by a committee of the council? Cannot the right hon. Gentleman accept that body in lieu of the distress committee?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am sorry I cannot.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the additional grant promised tied up in the same way?

MR. JOHN BURNS: It is not a question of the money being tied up; it will be freely and generously distributed.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: The point is whether the additional £100,000 promised to the Central Fund is to be distributed through distress committees only in the same way as the first £200,000?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I can only say that wherever representations are made to me that distress committees are not in existence, but in the opinion of the local people should be formed, I give the matter sympathetic and prompt attention. But I cannot supersede the distress committee which is the proper authority to disburse the money. I cannot hand the money to some other body which I think ought not to be sanctioned.

Christmas Work at the Post Office.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General how many applications for temporary employment in the Post Office at Christmas were received in the metropolitan districts, including Mount Pleasant and the General Post Office, on 21st, 22nd, 23rd, and 24th October this year; and how many of the applicants received appointments.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The number of applications on the four days in question for temporary employment at Christmas was about 3,600, and it is estimated that of this number about 1,200 will receive employment.

School Building Grant.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education how much of the £100,000 voted to new school buildings has been expended or allotted up to date.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): A Return giving the details asked for is in course of preparation, and will be laid before the House before the end of the month.

Estate Duty Office Clerks.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that much anxiety exists among the Second Division clerks in the Estate Duty Office, London, concerning the proposal to accompany the offer of promotion to the First Division to such of their number as are specially meritorious with the condition that they submit to a reduction of their salaries involving a loss which will not be recouped until some twenty years after the date of promotion; if he is aware that these condi ions will preclude many experienced men from accepting promotion owing to the time which must necessarily elapse before they can derive any financial benefit from such promotion; and whether he proposes to take any steps to remedy the alleged grievances.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: At the same time, may I ask the Secretary to the Treasury if, in view of the fact that the new scheme for staffing the Estate Duty Office involves a reduction of salary in the case of certain clerks on promotion, he can see his way to making such alterations therein as will remove this apparent injustice.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): I cannot admit that any real grievance or injustice exists. These clerks had the option of selecting the new position with promotion or of remaining on the scale of the Second Division. I would also refer the hon. Member to my Answer of 13th July last to the hon. Member for St. Patrick's Division of Dublin.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the average loss of salary which these clerks will sustain?

MR. HOBHOUSE: They will not sustain any loss ultimately. They have agreed to take lower payment at present in order to get a higher maximum in the future.

MR. THORNTON: Is it a fact that a large number of these clerks are holding back with the result that there is likely to be congestion in the office?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I have no such information.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): Is it proposed to apply this principle to other offices, to Cabinet Ministers for instance, and reduce their salaries on promotion?

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: Are we to understand that these clerks agree to the holding back of their salaries?

MR. HOBHOUSE: They had the option of accepting promotion to the higher class with an ultimately higher maximum or remaining under existing conditions. Some desired to remain, while others accepted promotion.

Mr. CARLILE: Can the hon. Gentleman consider the State an ideal employer when it thus reduces the salaries of its employees?

[No Answer was returned.]

Estate Duty in Scotland.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that in Scotland, under the Finance Act of 1894, estates are called upon to pay Estate Duty twice under the decision in Gunning's case, 44 S. L. R., page 514, whereas in England estates similarly situated are called upon to pay duty only once; and whether he will take the earliest opportunity of rectifying this matter, either by legislation or otherwise.

Mr. HOBHOUSE (for Mr. Lloyd-George): I must refer my hon. friend to the answer given to him by the Lord Advocate on the 27th ultimo. In England, Wales, and Ireland a revocable donation is also chargeable with estate duty on the death of the donor.

Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. BLACK (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that under the Old-Age Pensions Act the applicants have to produce to the pensions officer satisfactory evidence of their age, and as most of the present applicants were born before the Registration Act of 1837 the only legal proof in many cases is a certificate of baptism, and that the clergy who have the custody of the baptismal registers are in some parishes of North Bedfordshire charging 2s. 6d. each for the certificate, 1d. for stamp, and 1s. for search fee, or a total of 3s. 7d.; and, in view of the nature of these charges, will he say if the pensions officer has the right to inspect the register and so satisfy himself as to the ages of the applicants: and, if so, will he instruct the pensions officers accordingly, and so relieve the applicants from payment of the fees.

Mr. HOBHOUSE (for Mr. Lloyd-George): The Act requires that the claimant should have attained the age of seventy as a condition for the grant of a pension, and the pensions officer cannot, of course, report favourably upon any claim unless he is satisfied that this condition is fulfilled. He is not, however, required to obtain legal proof, if he can satisfy himself by other means that the condition is fulfilled, and pensions officers have instructions to dispense with the production of actual certificates, whenever possible. Pensions officers have, as such, no rights of inspecting ecclesiastical registers; and in any case my right hon. friend fears it would be impossible, in view of the conditions of pressure under which they are now working, for them to undertake such inspections at the present time, without delaying the consideration of a large number of claims beyond 31st December, with consequent disappointment to claimants. The whole question is, however, receiving his careful consideration.

Mr. BLACK asked whether it was contemplated under the Old-Age Pensions Act that, in rural parishes, clergymen should benefit, at the expense of their poorest parishioners, from £2 to £10 a year.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot answer these Questions off-hand.

Investment in Colonial Securities.

Mr. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of giving small investors facilities for investing their savings in remunerative Colonial securities, while at the same time making it plain to them that such securities are guaranteed by Colonial Governments and not by the Home Government.

Mr. HOBHOUSE (for Mr. Lloyd-George): The provision of such facilities appears to be a matter for the Governments which issue the securities.

Mr. BECK: But do not small investors find great difficulties in the way of getting these securities?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Possibly, but it is a matter for the Governments concerned.

Beer Ingredients.

SIR JOHN BARKER (Penryn and Falmouth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the Inland Revenue Departments can furnish a complete list of all the articles which have come under their notice as being used in the manufacture or preservation of beer other than malt, hops, sugar, yeast, or water.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend will cause to be printed with the Votes a list of the articles other than malt, hops, sugar, yeast and water, which have come under the notice of the Inland Revenue Departments, as being occasionally used in the manufacture or preservation of beer.

Old Age-Pensions Administration.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is the practice in the administration of the Old-Age Pensions Act for the pensions officer to submit every claim and his report on it to the supervisor; whether, in the case of a difference of opinion between the pensions officer and the supervisor as to the validity of a claim, the views of both or only one of them are laid before the pensions committee; and whether, if such differences of opinion should delay the granting of a pension in the case of a claim ultimately held to be good, any provision will be made to recoup to the pensioner the moneys of which he has been deprived by the delay.

MR. HOBHOUSE (for Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE): All claims are submitted to the pensions committee by the pensions officer who has carried out the investigation, through the supervisor, who is the superior pensions officer in charge of the district. No case of ultimate difference of opinion between these officers has been brought to the notice of the Board of Inland Revenue. If such a case arose, it would be resolved in ordinary official course, and the final opinion of the supervisor would be the basis of the report to the committee. It is not anticipated that any delay in granting pensions will arise out of this procedure.

Old-Age Pensions in Ireland.

MR. KETTLE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the principle or standard employed by pension officers in Ireland in calculating, for the purpose of the Old-Age Pension Act, the income presumed to be derived from small agricultural holdings; and is this income taken as bearing any fixed proportion to the rent, the purchase annuity, or the Poor Law valuation of the holding.

MR. HOBHOUSE (for Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE): Pension officers exercise their discretion in dealing with this class of case. The assessment of the advantage derived from the occupation of a holding is a matter of considerable difficulty, and, while the amount of the rent in many cases provides a useful working measure of such advantage, it has not been possible to lay down an invariable rule on that basis. Each case has to be considered upon its merits with reference to the amount of rent paid and to other considerations affecting the value of the holding to the occupier as a source of income and means of subsistence.

Pensions Claims Delays.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that owing to the extent of their districts some pension officers will not be able to complete their investigation of claims in time to enable eligible applicants to gain the benefits of the Old-Age Pensions Act from 1st January; and whether in such cases he will see that ample provision is made.

MR. HOBHOUSE: So far as my right hon. friend is at present aware he sees good reason to hope that all pension officers will be able to complete their investigation of claims in time to enable claimants to obtain their pensions on 1st January.

MR. CULLINAN: But in cases where the investigation is not complete will some assurance be given?

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend hopes they will all be completed.

Petitions in Favour of Woman Suffrage.

MR. P. W. WILSON (St. Pancras, S.): I beg to ask the Chairman of the Select Committee on Public Petitions whether he can say how many signatures on petitions in favour of woman suffrage have been recorded in each of the last ten years.

*MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth) replied that the figures were as follows:—1899, 6,157; 1900, 7; 1901, 30,178; 1902, 39,079; 1903, 13,990; 1904, 11,946; 1905, 8,153; 1906, 3,199; 1907, 1,538; and 1908 (to 5th November), 1,965.

Scottish Fishery Cruiser Contract.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland what is the contract date of delivery in the case of the fishery cruiser for Scotland, or, if there is no specified date, when delivery is expected.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The vessel is expected to be completed at 31st March next.

Douglas Estate, Longford.

MR. J. PHILLIPS (Longford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of acres comprised in the grass ranches of the Douglas estate, parish of Cloonguish, County Longford, Ireland; what complement the Estates Commissioners have acquired of this property; the Report of their inspector and his name; who are the persons for whom the land is acquired; and whether they are the evicted tenants of this property or farmers with uneconomic holdings in Cloonguish parish, or adjoining parishes, in the congested district of North Longford.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have given notice of their intention to acquire compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act 395 acres of the Douglas Estate. An inspector has been directed to visit the property, and, until his Report is received and the lands have been acquired, it would be premature to make arrangements for their allotment.

Cork Evicted Tenants.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Cork Evicted Tenants' Association requesting the Estates Commissioners to approach the owners of the demesnes at Templemary, Buttevant, and Mount Leader, Millstreet, the sale, or intended sale, of which was recently announced, with a view to acquiring these lands for the benefit of the evicted tenants, and also asking them to enter into communication with the present owner of the untenanted lands at Drishane, Mr. P. Slack, Ballinahown, Fermoy, so that these may also be acquired for the beneficent purposes of the Land Act of 1903; and whether it is intended to comply with this request in the manner mentioned.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received a copy of the resolution referred to. Demesne lands cannot be acquired compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, but the Commissioners will ascertain whether the owners are willing to sell the lands voluntarily.

Irish Land Purchase.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the amount of money actually paid, and for which agreements have been signed, under the Land Purchase Act, 1903.

MR. BIRRELL: The amount advanced under the Irish Land Act, 1903, up to 31st October, 1908, was £25,331,240. The Estates Commissioners are not yet in a position to state the total amount involved in the agreements lodged up to that date, but they are having the agreements scheduled as rapidly as possible.

Clooneen Hartland Farm, Roscommon.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the farm known as Clooneen Hartland, of about 350 acres, near Strokestown, County Roscommon, is about to be sold to the Estates Commissioners; whether it is intended to sell the same to a land agent; and, if so, whether he will direct the attention of the Commissioners to the fact that, in the immediate neighbourhood, there are many small uneconomic holdings which might profitably be increased if the farm in question were split up and divided amongst them.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the particulars given in the Question are not sufficient to enable them to identify the farm referred to.

Templemary Estate, Cork.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the sale of a portion of the Templemary demesne, County Cork, by the owner, Mr. Fuge, the auction announcement contained a clause to the effect that when the ordinary sales of the holdings to the incoming tenants were completed agreements for purchase through the Land Commissioners shall be executed by the vendor and immediate possession handed over to the purchasers, and that, though the lands are subject to the normal rent of £25, the annuity payable by the purchaser to the Land Commission is £16 5s. 6d. per annum; whether he is aware that the statement contained in this announcement of sale is directly contrary to the policy declared in the Report of the Estates Commissioners for the year ended 31st March, 1906, which stated that they had refused applications for purchase where the vendor had parcelled untenanted land in his occupation into holdings, put them up to auction to the highest bidder subject to an assumed rental, and then proposed to sell at once, under the Act of 1903, the holdings thus created to the auction purchasers; whether any such application was received in respect of the Templemary demesne; can he say how many similar applications were received since 1906 by the Commissioners; and, seeing that the auction purchasers in these cases are invariably large farmers or graziers who already possess extensive farms, whilst small uneconomic holdings exist in the neighbourhood and the labourers and evicted tenants are unprovided for, will he state whether it is the intention of the Government to legislate against this evil in their Land Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: As regards the general question of the creation of tenancies by owners of demesnes and other untenanted lands I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to his Question of 22nd October. The Estates Commissioners understand that the owner of the estate referred to in the Question intended to put up portion of his demesne lands for sale as stated. The auction did not, however, take place, and the Commissioners at his request are having a preliminary inspection made with a view to estimating the price they would advance if formal proceedings are instituted for the sale of the lands to them as untenanted. Estates in which purchase agreements were lodged since 1906 have not yet been reached for inspection, and the Commissioners are not, therefore, in a position to say in how many cases the agreements have been signed by auction purchasers.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Can the right hon. Gentleman hold out some hope that in the distribution of something like 1,000,000 acres of untenanted land in Ireland the claims of over 100,000 agricultural labourers who occupy the same position in the South of Ireland as the migratory labourers in the west will not be totally ignored?

MR. BIRRELL: I quite feel the force of the observations of the hon. Member. The difficulty is that there is not enough land in Ireland to go round, and I do not like to make promises about untenanted land which has already in the minds of a great number of people in Ireland been appropriated to them. As regards the point raised that in various parts of Ireland labourers may be in the same position as similar cotters in the west, the Attorney-General tells me that they may be partly provided for in the consideration of the subject.

Irish Untenanted Lands.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a demand made by the Irish Land and Labour Association that a certain proportion of the untenanted lands in each locality should be specially set apart to meet the claims of the labourers, and urging that, as a special Labourers Department has now been set up in the Local Government Board to deal with purely labour matters, the allocation and distribution of the untenanted land so set apart should be entrusted to this Department, also claiming that access to this untenanted land should be fixed as a reward for superior intelligence, industry, and thrift amongst the labouring population; and, seeing the dissatisfaction which exists everywhere amongst the labourers over the present method of the distribution of untenanted land by the Estates Commissioners, and which has led to serious disorder in several counties, will he say whether this matter has engaged, or will engage, the attention of the Government, with a view to the inclusion of suitable ameliorative provisions, on the lines mentioned, in the forthcoming Land Bill.

Mr. BIRRELL: The demand referred to substantially amounts to a claim that a portion of the untenanted land purchased by the Estates Commissioners for the enlargement of small holdings and the other purposes of the Act should be specially set apart for the creation of holdings for agricultural labourers. I would remind the hon. Member that Parliament has in recent years made substantial provision for agricultural labourers in Ireland in the shape of cottages and suitable plots of land, and I cannot hold out any hope that the forthcoming Land Bill will contain proposals in the direction which the hon. Member desires.

Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps will be taken by the Board of Intermediate Education in Ireland to ascertain whether suitable candidates, educated in Ireland and conversant wth Irish educational conditions, are available for appointment to the newly-established inspectorships under that Board before entertaining applications from candidates not so qualified.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of Intermediate Education propose, before making any appointments, to issue advertisements inviting applications for inspectorships, and they hope thus to ascertain whether there are suitable candidates who have been educated in Ireland and are conversant with Irish educational conditions. There is no doubt that, other things being equal, preference will be given to candidates who are either resident in or connected with Ireland.

Infirmary Patients and Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether infirmary patients under medical treatment are entitled to the benefits of the Old-Age Pensions Act; and, if so, whether, in view of the lack of proper accommodation or classification, as in the male portion of the Tipperary workhouse, he will instruct pension officers not to disqualify applicants because of the want of such provisions.

Mr. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to the terms of Section 3 (1) of the Old-Age Pensions Act. It rests with the pension committee, subject to an appeal to the Local Government Board, to decide whether or not the report of the pension officer on any particular case should be accepted. The Local Government Board cannot undertake to give directions to the pension officers as suggested, but, in the event of an appeal to the Board, the circumstances of each case will be fully investigated.

Afforestation and Coast Erosion.

Mr. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state when the Report on Afforestation of the Coast Erosion Commission will be presented; and whether, in the event of schemes of work being recommended, immediate action can be taken by the departments concerned to employ men now out of work.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): As I informed my hon. friend the Member for Tottenham last week, the Royal Commission hope to report on the question of afforestation early next year, and no definite time can yet be fixed for the issue of their Report on Coast Erosion. The Answer to the second part of the Question must depend on the nature of the recommendations of the Commission; but the hon. Member may be assured that the Government will use every effort to give effect to any practicable schemes that may be put before them.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) asked whether in view of the fact that there were over ten pages of Amendments, the Prime Minister could not re-consider the allocation of business so as to avoid the Report Stage and Third Reading of the Scottish Education Bill being taken on the same day. He reminded the right hon. Gentleman that he promised to allow adequate time for discussion.

MR. ASQUITH said he was anxious that both stages of the Bill should be completed that night as the Government wanted to send the Bill up to the House of Lords without delay, and there was no prospect of an early day.

MR. WATT: Why should Scotsmen have to sit up all night?

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): Can a measure like this be carefully considered in the small hours of the morning?

MR. ASQUITH: There is no necessity to talk about the small hours of the morning. On the whole, it is a non-contentious Bill. All classes in Scotland desire it to pass into law, and I see no reason why with a slight extension of the ordinary hours it should not go through.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Education (Scotland) Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 189; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 363.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, Wiliiam (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Aiden, Percy
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beck, A. Cecil
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)

Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal,E.
M'Cullum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scwhann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Joseph
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pirie, Duncan V.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Sutherland, J. E.
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Watt, Henry A.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended (in the Standing Committee), read.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) moved to recommit the Bill in respect of Clause 15, which provides for the application of the Scottish Education Fund. He said that the Motion had stood on the Notice Paper of the House ever since the beginning of the Autumn Session, and the Amendments which he had since put down had also stood on the Paper for a month, so that all the Scottish Members were perfectly cognisant of the object he had in view. He quite felt that his action in moving to recommit the Bill might not meet with the approval of the Secretary for Scotland, and he would like to say at the outset, what he thought was the opinion of every Member of the Grand Committee on the Bill, that both he and his colleague the hon. Member for South Down, who represented the Irish Party on that Committee, supported the Government generally, and it was only because they did not succeed in getting a satisfactory solution of what they claimed, viz., that the Catholic schools of Scotland should be put on a fair and equitable basis, that he moved the recommittal of the Bill in respect of Clause 15. He was making no claim for any additional charge upon the Scottish Education Fund; his object was to make clear and definite what up to now was vague and indefinite. That was to say that after the interests of the various University, secondary, and board schools had been complied with under Clause 15, the only way in which the Catholic schools and the other voluntary schools of Scotland could benefit was by sharing in the residue of the grant which would then remain over, and it was because he hoped to get from the Secretary for Scotland something more definite as to the extent of that residue, that he had adopted this method of approaching the discussion. He would also like to point out in justification of his action that when Clause 15 was being discussed in Committee the question of the cumulative vote, which gave the Catholics positions on boards and enabled them to control to a certain extent the incidence of rates, was decided. It was true that the Government proposed to destroy the cumulative vote, but there was a general feeling that it might be left to the Committee to decide for itself, and as a matter of fact when the cumulative vote was discussed the numbers were extremely even, and he was not without hope that that vote might be restored, or that they might get proportional representation. The pension scheme of the Government was postponed from Clause 10 in order to be dealt with at the end of the Bill, and under the proposals of the Government in that pension scheme undoubtedly new charges were practically created upon the Scottish Education Fund, which were dealt with as a whole under Clause 15. He had, therefore, two main reasons in urging the recommittal of the Bill in respect of that clause. After the various claims of the University, secondary, and board schools had been dealt with, a residue of the Scottish Education Fund was left, and it was out of that residue that the Catholic schools alone could be expected to benefit. He would like to agree, however, that under the main provisions of the Bill, in so far as the voluntary schools could share with the board schools in central grants, they were undoubtedly improved in position, but that was only to the extent that they were sharing in a general increase. Over and above that, the whole cost of education in Scotland had been rising, and under this Bill was bound to continue to rise, and the Catholic schools would be in the position of having to contribute a very large sum, amounting to 25s. per head of the children attending, in order to get up to the position occupied by the board schools. It was in order to remedy that injustice that he brought forward this proposal. He would further like to point out that his object in asking for a sum not exceeding 10s. was in no sense to put the Catholic schools on the same basis as the board schools. They would still be in receipt of 15s. per head less than the board schools. He put 10s. as the high water mark of their demand, but recognising that the Education Fund might not be able to give the whole amount he was willing to accept a lesser sum if the Secretary for Scotland said the fund could not bear that particular amount. He desired to show that they were making a reasonable claim. The Catholic schools in Scotland had been conducted for years on the free principle. They had been maintained by the Catholics out of voluntary contributions. That was the price of their freedom, and the Catholics were willing to go on paying a certain amount, but they could not face the indefinite future unless they knew that to some extent they would not be called upon to contribute impossible amounts. In that respect he thought from what they saw in that day's papers that there was some reason to hope that the Government would recognise the position of the voluntary schools. It looked as if there was going to be educational peace in England, and why should not educational peace also prevail in

Scotland? He thought it was recognised that the board schools in Scotland were practically denominational in the sense that the Presbyterian system was practically universal in the board schools, and if the claims of the voluntary schools were met he saw no reason why educational peace should not obtain in Scotland. At the same time, he was bound to say on behalf of the Catholic archbishop and bishops of Scotland, and the school managers, that their future action was absolutely dependent on the reply of the Secretary for Scotland. The circular which had been issued by the Catholic archbishop and bishops of Scotland showed that whereas the board schools, per head of the children in average attendance, received 65s. 11½d., the Catholic schools received only 40s. 5¾d., or a difference in favour of the board schools of no less than 25s. 5¾d. If his claim was met, that would be reduced to 15s., and that he did not consider an unreasonable claim to make. It was utterly impossible for the Catholic schools to obtain the full earning grant of their pupils, because they were unable, with the limited funds at their disposal, to keep their schools up to the same high standard as the board schools. The earning grant was enormously dependent, not only upon equipment, but upon the salaries which could be given to teachers, and under the present system in no sense would the Catholic schools as a whole be able to compete in earning power with the board schools. He laid great stress upon that fact because, as the cost of education grew, so much more would the Catholics of Scotland find it difficult to pay the high salaries necessary to maintain the same standard of efficiency as the board schools, with their power of drawing upon the rates, to which the Catholics had to contribute. The other point to which he desired to allude was the question of the teachers' pensions. To a certain extent that also came under Clause 15. As that scheme eventually left the Committee, the managers of the schools were called upon to contribute very largely to the teachers' superannuation. While they were all desirous of seeing a proper scheme of superannuation for the teachers carried out, that additional contribution put upon the managers must be borne in mind in looking to the future. If the Catholics had not only to contribute to the keeping up of the schools, but to obtain funds to cope with the teachers' superannuation scheme, it was evident that a greater burden was put upon the capacity of the managers. For these and other reasons, he urged most strongly upon the Government, if they could not see their way at this stage to agree to the recommittal of the Bill in order to safeguard the interests of the Catholic schools, and to see that these schools obtained a definite share out of the Scottish Education Fund rather than a vague and indefinite one, with which they could not be expected to be satisfied, that at least before they went to a division the Secretary for Scotland would indicate to what extent he could see his way to meet their case on the Report stage.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said that, in seconding the Motion, he desired to make a few points absolutely clear. The first was that he and his colleagues had no opposition to offer to the Bill as a whole. He thought the Secretary for Scotland would do them the justice to admit that at no stage had they offered anything in the nature of factious opposition. The second point he wished to make was that their action that day was not inspired either by any feeling of resentment at the manner in which the Catholics in Scotland had been treated in the past, or by any fears as to the manner in which they would be treated in the future. He thought nothing could redound more to the credit of the Scottish people than the fact that, although they held strong political and religious opinions, and clung tenaciously to them, they gladly accorded to those who worshipped the same God at different shrines the same freedom that they claimed for themselves. If he had any lingering doubts in his own mind on that point, they would have disappeared after his experience in Grand Committee on this Bill. He and his hon. friend experienced nothing but the greatest toleration and consideration from all those who differed from them. There was an atmosphere of peace throughout the whole proceedings of that Committee. From the beginning to the end of the rather prolonged sittings, he thought he might say he never once heard mentioned the name of Cowper-Temple, nor the Westminster Catechism, nor the right of entry. They were a harmonious and happy family until, as might perhaps be naturally expected in the case of a Scottish Bill, they came to the question of the division of the bawbees, and then they had to part company. While the board schools of Scotland received from public sources 65s. 11d. a head for the children attending, the Catholic schools only received 40s. 5d., although they were doing the same work and satisfying the same tests as the board schools. He did not think they would be making an extravagant demand if they said that the Catholic schools should be treated on an absolute equality with the board schools. He had been told by some of his Scottish friends that they had got their remedy, that they were penalised financially because they did not go into the national system, and that they could not have it both ways. But what was the fact? In Scotland they had one of the most denominational systems of education in the world. The board school system in Scotland was essentially a Presbyterian system, and the Catholics of Scotland were the Nonconformists to the Establishment. In the Catholic schools there were about 100,000 children, with 73,215 in average attendance. These schools had been maintained in the past against tremennous odds. They had been supported by pennies and sixpennies contributed ungrudingly and freely by the Catholic working men, mainly Irishmen resident in Scotland. In addition to that they had saved the public since 1875 no less than £1,000,000 in buildings and sites alone, besides saving the taxpayers and ratepayers no less than £93,000 a year by the education of their own children. He submitted that that was penalising the Catholic ratepayers of Scotland in a most unjust manner. They were quite willing to make sacrifices for their conscience, and to pay a ransom for the liberty of educating their children in their own way, but they submitted that the Presbyterian children in Scotland were educated at the public cost, and it was not an extravagance that the Catholics should say that the public should pay also the whole cost of education by the system that satisfied the parents of Catholic children. The Motion did not go so far as that. It did not ask them to be generous or even to be just; it made the modest appeal that the Government should increase the grant per head by 10s., which would still leave them 15s. worse off than the children attending the board schools. He was not without hope that the Secretary for Scotland would give them some reason to believe that in the immediate future something would be done to redress the inequality under which the Catholics of Scotland laboured.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills in respect of Clause 15."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he was rather surprised that since the hon. Member who had just spoken had such complete faith in the best of all possible Governments, he and his friends had found it necessary to put down this Motion. He was not certain that those of his countrymen who belonged to the creed of those hon. Members would be quite satisfied that the case had been put with all the firmness and determination to which it was entitled. He himself belonged by tradition and custom to the Established Church of Scotland. He looked with detachment, but all the same with a friendly detachment, upon the Nonconformist bodies in Scotland, the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian communities. He had had a long and close connection with those communities, and he had had no better experience than he had had of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church of Scotland in dealing with educational questions. He knew how deeply they felt and how ready they were to make sacrifices, and he was not disposed to think, knowing them as intimately as he did, that they were quite so satisfied to trust their future to the tender mercies of the Government as the two hon. Members who had spoken seemed to think. The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian Churches had made heavy sacrifices and were always ready—he said it from an experience of twenty years, during which he had been in close connection with them—to listen to any reasonable terms, to make things easy for the Department, and often to accept what was admitted to be unjust in principle as fairly satisfactory. They had in this Bill taken away from those churches that representation on the school boards which they had hitherto had, which always secured in the largest school boards of Scotland a strong element of Roman Catholic and Episcopalian representation. He knew by experience how strongly that had helped the administration of the Education Act, how liberal-minded these Roman Catholic priests and others were who sat upon those boards, how ready they were to help the work of the school boards, and how constantly they set the education of the children as the foremost plank in their platform. The Government had done away with that. They were also adding enormously to the cost of education. They were now opening ranges of education which had not been opened before. What had been their experience in England with regard to this extension? Had they not heard of rates that now had to deal in England with every sort of school, and had they not heard how vastly those rates were increased? Was it not clear that the Roman Catholics of of Scotland were in real danger, and that that danger was near at hand? These schools would increase in cost and would necessarily have to keep up the competition; the burden would become heavier and heavier every day. It had been pointed out that the difference in the grants made to the board schools and the Roman Catholic schools was something like 25s. per head, and in the Episcopalian schools, it was something like 24s. He admitted the injustice, but it was not a thing which had merely to be stated and then left entirely to the mercy of the Government. He was prepared to say that he thought the Roman Catholic schools of Scotland expected them to make a fight for their rights in this respect. What were the facts? The Roman Catholics provided places for about a hundred thousand children, or about an eighth of all the children in Scotland, and they had an average attendance of between seventy and eighty thousand. They got the annual grant, the fee grant, and so on, but the hon. Member had forgotten to state what was their chief grievance, viz., that they actually contributed about £40,000 a year, or nearly 10s. a head, out of their own pockets to the Roman Catholic schools. What right had the Government to demand of these voluntary managers, paying rates as they did, contributing to the upkeep of the schools they did not use, that they should further pay out of their own pockets 10s. a head for their own children? When they had provided the 10s. they were still left with a deficit, and this meant the starvation of the schools. He knew that many of the teachers in the Roman Catholic schools were content to work for a miserable pittance, in the way of salary, but beyond all that they must necessarily starve the schools. They had no resources and no power of borrowing money as the board schools had for their buildings. Their buildings must be paid for entirely out of their own pockets, and their schools would have to be starved, and that in spite of the fact that they were paying this 10s. out of their own pockets. Hon. Members below the gangway were quite entitled to ask whether, when the Unionists were in office, they had ever shown any desire in the direction of decreasing the burden. His answer was that they had, and that his party in its Education Bills of 1903 and 1904 provided for helping these voluntary schools, which were to be made eligible for aid from school boards if the latter chose to give it them. There was no compulsion about it. He would ask the attention of the House to one or two passages in the debate which were not without interest. Although the Bills did not pass, they had many friends on the other side, especially in those now on the Treasury Bench. The Secretary of State for War, who alluded to the generous treatment of the Bills of 1903 and 1904 of the Roman Catholic schools, said he thought the Secretary for Scotland was to be congratulated on the way in which the religious difficulty had been met. The right hon. Gentleman had more sympathy, he was bound to say, than an hon. friend of his for the denominations of Scotland. The hon. Member to whom he referred was now the Lord Advocate, who was at first inclined to turn a deaf ear to the proposal, but said at that time he was glad to hear that before grants were made to these elementary institutions conditions laid down by a representative body must be complied with. They were ready to do that. But there was a more interesting quotation to which he had to allude, from a right hon. Gentleman who sat upon the Treasury bench, with regard to their proposal in reference to voluntary schools. The right hon. Gentleman the present Chancellor of the Exchequer intervened in this Scottish debate, and said that he understood that under the Bill the treatment of the voluntary schools in Scotland was to be different from that of the voluntary schools in England, as an option to give rate-aid would be left with the local authority. When, the right hon. Gentleman added, the people of England claimed a similar right they were told they were to go to gaol. The right hon. Gentleman welcomed the expedient which they proposed to the Scottish people, and did not grudge what his colleagues had not the courage to introduce in this Bill, and yet this was the Government to which the Members below the gangway were ready to trust these Roman Catholic schools.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: We will trust nobody; we will paddle our own canoe.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK hoped that that paddling would be effective. The present Lord Advocate, was not so strong a supporter of the measure as his colleague the Secretary of State for War. The right hon. Gentleman saw difficulties about it, and his difficulties were increased as he made a further acquaintance with it. Was it possible that there might have been some "rift in the lute" of Cabinet harmony over this Bill, and in consequence of a slight difference of opinion that useful, courageous, generous, and just clause was dropped out of it? But the right hon. Gentleman had a colleague, whom he was sorry not to see present when a debate of this interest for Scotland was being carried on. He referred to the hon. and learned Member the Solicitor-General. There was no doubt as to what his opinion on this treatment of voluntary schools was. The Lord Advocate had thrown slight doubts upon the Bill; he was not so enthusiastic as the Secretary of State for War; but the Solicitor-General said that the manner in which the Bill dealt with voluntary and denominational schools was—

> "as sagacious as it was tactful."

There was, he said—

> "no disposition whatever on the part of school boards to refuse grants of public money to such schools as were giving efficient education, but they would only do so provided there was a modicum of local control"

So far as he could judge, he added—

> "from the Roman Catholics in his own constituency, that modicum of local control would not be refused, provided it was confined to secular instruction."

They only said on this occasion, therefore, what hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who were now occupying the Treasury bench said when they were in opposition. Why, when that Bill failed to pass from no lack of aid on their part, were they not bold enough to put this clause of it in the Bill to take away what was a serious grievance? The hon. Member who last spoke seemed to be under some hallucination, for he said that he was quite certain that no hon. Member from Scotland would state there or from a platform, although he might say it privately, that the system of education in Scotland was practically denominational. If the hon. Member desired such an announcement on the platform or in the House from him, he was perfectly ready to make it. There was no question whatever that, for all practical purposes, the education of Scotland was a denominational system, and that in nine-tenths of the schools Presbyterianism was taught to the satisfaction of the great mass of the people. There was no question as to the fact, and he was not arguing against its justice. For himself, he thought it was perfectly right that the majority of the inhabitants of a district should have a right to choose the religion to be taught in their schools, always provided that this further condition was duly observed, that the minority had their rights preserved and were not crushed down under the tyranny of grants in aid or taxation in the benefits of which they did not share. He would ask the Secretary for Scotland to pause before he refused to listen to this fair and just demand. They had had no difficulty of denominationalism in Scotland, as he knew from the experience of twenty years. They had been able to reconcile Roman Catholics to measures and administration which were in certain points of principle unjust, by constantly watching that the pressure should not be too heavy, constantly listening to every reasonable demand, constantly trying to ease off the pressure of the money bearing hardly upon them. But that would no longer be the case, if with the increasing expenditure to which the Bill would lead, they steadily left these Roman Catholics, these denominationalists—he spoke of them generally—without the just remedy which they had the right to demand, and which the Secretary of State for War was himself determined to demand for them. If they allowed this opportunity to pass he warned the right hon. Gentleman with absolute confidence that they would be laying up for Scotland a resuscitation of the denominational and sectarian difficulty based upon the absolute justice and rectitude of the claims which would be put forward. Until they dealt with those claims with some form of justice, they could not rest satisfied in their conscience as a Government, or as Presbyterian Members responsible to their constituencies. The Government thought that because in the past they had moved along easily and smoothly they would continue to do so. They had always been proud to see how little was the religious difficulty in Scotland as compared with England, but if the Government refused this principle of justice and aggravated the injustice and the burden, not many years, he was convinced, would pass before they would see Scotland again plunged into the sectarian difficulty.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Perhaps, Sir, as I am the only Member on the Treasury bench who has escaped the thunderbolts of my hon. friend, I may be allowed to reply to him; and let me say, before I pass to the question before the House, that we have nothing whatever to do with the Bills of the hon. Gentleman opposite and his friends. This Bill is founded on an entirely different principle. It is a different scheme, and our withers are quite unwrung by his denunciations on that score. The hon. Member who moved the recommittal of the Bill has done so in the first place because of his apprehension that the Catholic schools in Scotland will be worse off and less able to meet their responsibilities than at present if this Bill passes into law. I prefer to speak on this topic of the voluntary schools as a whole. It is not a question of Roman Catholic schools as against any other schools. We know no difference in Scotland, and we make no difference in the administration and legislation between the schools of one denomination and another. There is educational peace in Scotland, and I can assure hon. Members nothing is more likely to disturb that peace than the acceptance of this proposal which the hon. Member wishes to be considered on recommittal. With regard to his fears as to the effect of the distribution of the balance under Clause 15 the Government have made careful calculations as to how those schools will be placed when this fund is distributed. I say confidently that not only is there not a denomination, but there is not a school belonging to a denomination in Scotland which will not be better off under this Bill when passed, and more able to meet its responsibilities, than it is at present. I make that definite and categorical statement. I gave this assurance in Committee, and I repeat it in this House. The hon. Gentleman need have no fear that the schools in which he is interested, even taking into account their increased responsibilities, will be less able to meet them than now.

MR. BOLAND: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the figures?

MR. SINCLAIR: It is impossible to give the figures, but the hon. Member may take my assurance on that point, which is founded on the most careful calculations. I understand it is the view of the hon. Member and those who agree with him that this Bill does not go far enough to satisfy them, and they wish to review the whole position of the voluntary schools under the national system of Scotland. In a sense, it is true that the system is denominational, but that does not prevent its being national. The majority of the Scottish people are of the Presbyterian denomination, and the majority give a religious complexion to the school. That system, whether you call it denominational or not, is receptive of the opinions of any religious denomination and can be adapted and controlled by any denomination which finds itself in a majority in any particular locality. Let us take, first of all, the position of voluntary schools, so far as aid from taxes is concerned. A circular has been issued by the authority of the Catholic bishops, in which they criticise the distribution of the grants. There are three columns in the circular, namely, board schools, voluntary schools and Catholic schools. While the bishops who issued this circular are perfectly correct in saying that as an actual fact certain Catholic schools receive 22s. 4d. whereas other voluntary schools receive 23s., in respect of the average annual grant, and with regard to the aid grant Catholic schools receive 3s. 2d. instead of 3s. 6d., it must be remembered that that is not because it is not open to Catholic schools to earn as much money under these grants as other voluntary schools. It happens that some Catholic schools do not earn as much as other schools. In the first place, they have a larger proportion of younger children, and therefore the grants for higher grades are not so frequently earned. But there are Catholic schools in Scotland which earn large grants, and are more efficient than many board schools, and it is only in this way that these figures can be described as accurate. In fact the Catholic schools have an advantage, because the third aid grant is a grant that is specially distributed to voluntary schools, and in which board schools have no share. The net effect of the distribution of grants to Catholic schools in Scotland is very remarkable. So generous is the system that, in eighty-seven out of a total of 359 voluntary schools in Scotland, the Treasury grants exceed the whole expenditure of the school other than rent, and there are voluntary schools in Scotland in which the Treasury grants exceed the whole expenditure of the school including rent, and there is actually a small margin of money that cannot be said to go to any educational expense at all. These figures show that in respect of the distribution of money coming from Parliamentary grants the system of education in Scotland is, in fact, generous to the voluntary schools. As to the distribution of rates, the demand put forward by hon. Members opposite is that they should practically be given a share of the rates and be placed on the same footing as public schools in regard to rate aid, but they have never said that they are willing to comply with the only condition on which I hope this House will ever consent to give rate aid, namely, that the schools shall be publicly controlled. Short of that, it is impossible for us to go so far as hon. Members opposite wish in recognising that claim. Let me point out to hon. Gentlemen opposite how exceedingly generous and elastic the Scottish system of education and administration is. A school board can take the religious complexion of the community which elected it. It is in the power of any school board to prescribe the form of religious instruction to be given in its school. The consequence is that in one district of Scotland the majority of school boards are Catholic. The school board supplies the wants of a Catholic population in a particular district with a Protestant minority with perfect peace and harmony. Provision is made for the religious instruction of both Catholic and Protestant within the administration of the school board. It is perfectly possible for a school board which is not Catholic or voluntary to make such arrangements as it chooses for any section of the people and provide educational facilities for the particular religious belief of the minority. We have a case of that kind under the administration of the Glasgow School Board. In Glasgow there is a school for the education of defective and crippled children. That school supplies the wants of a Catholic population. That school is staffed and organised to meet the wishes of the Catholic minority. Whether you wish to go the whole length of establishing a school board which shall represent the Catholic majority, or whether you wish a Protestant school board to supply the education desired voluntarily by a Catholic minority in its district, the Scottish system meets both eventualities. I have little doubt that in Scotland where you have large communities including considerable minorities of voluntary persuasions, the door being so wide open for arrangements of this kind, it will be perfectly possible in future to develop and make this elasticity and adaptability meet the reasonable needs of the voluntary denominations. The difficulty is not with the system but with the denominations which have not complied with the condition which is necessary, namely, that with rate aid must go public control. In my opinion the Scottish system does meet all reasonable needs and certainly promotes educational peace. There is no feeling of friction or hardship as between the denominations with regard to the treatment they receive in the administration of education in Scotland. I, therefore, cannot accept the Motion of the hon. Gentleman and must ask the House after this discussion to come to a speedy conclusion and let us proceed with the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he must protest against the statement by which the right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech in reference to the Motion to recommit the Bill, that it would be the signal for the break-up of the educational peace which had hitherto existed in Scotland. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was justified in making a statement of that kind. After the two speeches they had heard from those benches, he thought everyone would agree that none were more anxious for a continuance of good feeling and peace in these matters in Scotland than were the Catholic representatives, and nobody would be more sorry to see any interference with the existing friendly relations than the Catholic citizens of Scotland. The Secretary for Scotland seemed to find fault with the figures supplied to his hon. friends by the Catholic bishops in Scotland. It could not be made a cause of complaint against them if they preferred to take those figures rather than the figures presented to them either by the right hon. Gentleman himself or from any other quarter of the House. He did not deny for a single moment that the right hon. Gentleman had given careful consideration to all these matters, but he would be ready to admit that those responsible for the education of Catholics in Scotland, particularly the bishops, had given at least as much careful consideration to the matter as the right hon. Gentleman himself or anybody else concerned in the question. The right hon. Gentleman had entirely failed to meet the case presented to the House. What was that case? They had a number of voluntary schools conducted by the Catholic Church in Scotland which, from the point of view of education, gave as much satisfaction and as much value in every way as any of the board schools, and yet they were penalised by their not receiving anything like the same amount of public money for their up-keep as the board schools got. The right hon. Gentleman had dragged into his speech the old contention as to rate-aid going hand in hand with popular control. A good deal could be said on that question, but he did not think it was one which ought to be discussed that afternoon at all, because the Catholics of Scotland were not asking for rate-aid at all; they were simply asking for an increase per head to enable them to keep their schools up to the level at which everybody desired to see them kept. The right hon. Gentleman had entirely failed to appreciate the peculiar circumstances which attached to the Catholic schools in Scotland. The Secretary for Scotland said that he desired to make no difference whatever between denominational schools of any complexion, and that he dealt with voluntary schools as a whole. He did not complain of the right hon. Gentleman's doing that, but he thought that the Catholic schools of Scotland required a certain amount of consideration which perhaps many other schools in Scotland would not care to claim. The Catholic schools were supported by the very poorest class of the population. It had been a heavy strain upon the Catholics to maintain their schools in the state of efficiency in which they were kept. Above and beyond all he hoped that the House in dealing with the matter would remember that these were the schools of children of the working classes. He did not quarrel with the references of the hon.

Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities to the schools of other denominations besides the Catholics in Scotland, but he thought the hon. Gentleman would be ready to admit that there was a difference between them. The whole of the Catholic schools had been maintained and kept up by the poorer sections of the population more than by any other, and if that were true—and it was absolutely true, he ventured to say— then it was a really good reason why some special consideration should be given to them. The hon. Gentleman apparently found fault with the Members who submitted this Motion because they had not done so in a sufficiently violent manner, or made a wholesale attack upon the Government. It would have been bad tactics to fire off the heavy guns or bring all their forces into line before they knew what they had to expect. He could assure the hon. Gentleman above the gangway, who had shown his new-born zeal for the Catholic citizens in Scotland, that their interests had been looked after and safeguarded by Members on the Irish benches long before they had the pleasure and advantage of his presence in the House. In his view it would be better for the interests of the cause which the hon. Gentleman so eloquently pleaded if he could manage to plead it in a way which would less convince the House that he was thinking of Tory and Liberal, and party interests all the time. The Catholics in Scotland and in this country had very wisely come to the conclusion that their interests rested with themselves; that it was only by relying on their own influence and the justice of their cause that they could bring conviction to the mind of the House; and that it was not by attaching themselves first to this Party and then to that in order to promote particular interests that anything special was likely to be done to improve the condition of their schools. He did not think it would be possible to put a case more moderately and reasonably than the way in which the present case had been put by his two hon. friends. He cordially endorsed everything his hon. friends had said with regard to the good feeling which existed between the different denominations in Scotland. He did not know of anything more pleasing, certainly to a Catholic Member of Parliament like himself, than to visit Scotland and to find there the greatest friendship, consideration, and good will displayed by people of all denominations. One would wish that the same spirit were more widely diffused in England. It was really because the Catholics of Scotland valued that good feeling that they were anxious that in making their present claim nothing should be done to break in upon the peace of Scotland as the happy land where people did not fight about religion. It was easy for the right hon. Gentleman to quote statistics and to burke the whole question by giving isolated cases here and there, which proved nothing, save that they were exceptions to the general rule. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the Catholic schools might, if they were only able, earn a great deal more money than they did—more than the voluntary schools, if not more than the board schools themselves. Dealing with cases of that kind, moreover, did not meet the central point, which was this. Here were, roughly speaking, 100,000 children of the poorest and most hard-working of the population of Scotland. Their parents were proud of their faith, in which they were anxious that their children should be educated. Out of their poverty, out of their poor resources, even out of their hunger and privation they had managed to build schools, and to maintain them, though very much handicapped; at the same time they had borne their full share of the general school rate, and had not received a penny in return. All the Catholics asked was that their schools should be allowed to exist in a state of efficiency, and be given the same opportunity as board schools and the schools of other denominations, to teach their children in an up-to-date way so that they could meet the requirements of the standard of education in Scotland. And what did it all come to in the matter of pounds, shillings, and pence? It was not a question of Catholic schools being better than Protestant schools; it was not a question of denominationalism at all. Everyone admitted that the Catholic schools had done good work; that was proved beyond doubt. They were conducted in accordance with belief in a certain religion, and because they were so conducted were they to be penalised and rendered incapable of coming up to the standard of education required? Were they to be told, simply because their schools were conducted under Catholic auspices, that they were to receive 25s. a year less per head for the maintenance of their scholars than the board schools of the country? The right hon. Gentleman must know perfectly well that the case which had been made out was one which could not be allowed to rest. He must know that if the peace which had happily hitherto prevailed was to continue, there must be some re-arrangement. After all, if it was a question of money why should not the House ask what the amount of money was? He was not in a position to say what the amount would be in the school rate of the various schools other than the Presbyterian schools in Scotland, but the very modest proposal of his hon. friends could not possibly exceed more than £35,000 or £40,000 a year. Was it worth while to leave a sense of injustice amongst a large section of citizens in Scotland because of some £30,000, £35,000, or £40,000 a year? If this matter could be settled, the most perfect satisfaction would prevail, and the education work of Scotland would go on in all schools—board schools and the schools of various denominations—without any sense of injustice or check. He asked the right hon. Gentleman therefore, not entirely to close the door, as he seemed to have done in his speech, and to obviate the necessity which Members of the House must have to make strong and prolonged protests if necessary, by telling them that some further consideration could be given to the matter, and that the demand which had been put forward would be to some extent, at any rate, granted. The right hon. Gentleman had not held out the slightest hope that any advance would be made to meet the claim which was so reasonably and so justly put forward. He had said that the effect of the Bill would be that denominational schools in Scotland would be in an improved condition. He did not think the Catholic bishops themselves denied that in certain respects the Bill would be an improvement, and that was why there was no desire or intention on the part of Catholic representatives to block or interfere with the measure, but they wanted to make it complete and satisfactory. The Secretary for Scotland was a fair-minded man who, he believed, was really anxious to do what was fair. Twenty years ago he travelled for three weeks with him in Dumbartonshire. They were very close political friends at the time, and he formed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman would undoubtedly seek to do what was fair by his (Mr. Redmond's) fellow-countrymen and co-religionists. He would be sorry to change that opinion, but the right hon. Gentleman's speech lacked entirely that sympathy which he was led to expect from him. There had been trouble and friction enough in England in reference to the education question, and they had had trouble and dissatisfaction in Ireland from time to time. Hitherto Scotland seemed to have been, in educational matters, the most peaceful and satisfied country of all. He was perfectly satisfied that it could and would remain so if in this fresh departure the Government recognised facts which could not be gainsaid, and met the legitimate claims of these schools, and did not fail to do justice for what, after all, in reference to an educational matter was at best a paltry sum. He was certain, as matters stood at present, there would be not only deep disappointment, but much dissatisfaction wherever these schools existed in Scotland. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, therefore, not to mar the work to which he had set his hand. It must be some satisfaction to a Minister to have a part in the passage into law of a measure of this kind, but such satisfaction would be entirely marred if when he returned to Scotland he found that a large section of the people, representing the hardest working people of the country, had a sense of injustice. He could understand perfectly the attitude of the Government if they were prepared to allege that these schools for which they pleaded did not come up to the required standard, and that the education given there was not satisfactory, but nothing of the kind could be alleged. Not the slightest reflection could be cast upon their good order, up-to-dateness, or efficiency, and it was unjust, unwise, and unstatesmanlike to penalise them. When the adherents of these schools asked why they were penalised, they never would take as the answer this talk of public control and rate aid, because they were not asking for the rates which even they paid. They were only asking for such an increase in the principle of State aid, which was already conceded, as would enable them to keep their schools in the future as they had been in the past, a credit to their denomination and generally to the educational development of Scotland.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) said he wished to add a word of appeal to the right hon. Gentleman in corroboration of what had been said by those who had spoken from the Irish benches and by the hon. Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities. He did not put it as the hon. Member for the Universities did in solemn tones upon the principle of abstract justice, but solely on the principle of expediency. They knew perfectly well that Catholics would not go to Protestant schools, and at the same time they recognised that it was absolutely necessary in the interests of the country that all the children should be kept up to a high standard. If the Catholics did not get some additional consideration from the Government it was certain that they must fall behind in the race. The right hon. Gentleman said he was perfectly convinced from very accurate calculations that he had made that voluntary schools in Scotland would be in a better position under the Bill than they were at present. If he had made those calculations with such remarkable accuracy, why could he not tell them what the figures were which would result from them? Hon. Gentlemen opposite were quite justified in asking for the figures. Even if the figure was less than 10s. he should be satisfied if the right hon. Gentleman could show that to some reasonable and fair extent he was going to enable Catholic schools to continue the efficiency which they at present possessed. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider this matter and give some kind of assurance, with which hon. Members opposite would be satisfied, that the position of their schools would be really better under the new system than they were at present.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) did not think the hon. Member for the Universities deserved the reproach that he had discussed the question from a party point of view. He did not intend to do that. He had been occupied in work of that kind in connection with another Bill, and was glad to get a holiday in the atmosphere of this Bill. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had fairly met the case put to him. Judging from the speeches of his colleagues they recognised that there was a great gap between the treatment of the voluntary and the board schools of Scotland, and it was one which ought to be met. In the former Bill it was proposed to give a purely optional power to school boards to meet that gap by means of rates, and he should have thought hon. Gentlemen opposite would have been willing to trust local authorities in a matter like that. He was certain that all the denominational schools of Scotland would be willing to accept a modicum of control in exact proportion to the modicum of rate aid which they might receive. This proposal dealt with the matter in a different way. There was no request for rate aid or for any new grant from the Imperial Exchequer. The only request made was that, of the funds already set apart for the purpose of education in Scotland, a small proportion should be given to helping these denominational schools, which were educating from one-eighth to one-ninth of the people of Scotland, and thereby fulfilling a public work in exactly the same manner as the other schools. How was this met or sought to be met? They had the greatest vagueness in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. If it was to be met at all it could only be by the last provision at the end of Clause 16. Clause 14 dealt with the way in which the Scottish Education Fund was made up. In Clause 15 they had a statement as to how it was to be distributed, and after six other purposes had been specified it said the balance might be made over to the district education fund. When they came to Clause 16 there were a number of specified purposes to which that district education fund might be applied, and at the very end of all it said any balance which might remain should be given over to the managers or to the school boards. Therefore, any chance that the managers might have of getting money must depend, first of all, on how much was over for the district fund from the Scottish Education Fund generally, and, in the second place, on the various purposes for which the district fund might be applied, and which would have to be satisfied before the managers could get anything at all. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to give some indication as to how he had arrived at the conclusion that there would be any money left at all. On the face of it there was nothing to show that, after all this immense number of other charges had been satisfied, there would be any balance available as specified at the end of Clause 16. If there was no balance available obviously the schools would not be better off, and inasmuch as the cost of education was steadily rising, and as there would be new charges under the Bill in respect of teachers and the rest, they might be very much worse off. The right hon. Gentleman had challenged the figures given with regard to the position of Scottish voluntary schools. With regard to earning power, he had argued in a vicious circle. They might earn less, but they did so because they had not the means of getting a sufficient staff, which was necessarily dependent on its earning power. Let him take it on rates alone. It could not be gainsaid that, putting the earning power aside altogether, there was an average amount per head of children in Scottish board schools of 22s. 5d., none of which went to voluntary schools at all, and as against that there was merely a sum of 3s. aid grant. Therefore, putting it at the very lowest there was a balance of 19s. 5d. to be made up. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman could quote here and there the case of a minority of schools in which the grant sufficed for the whole of their expenses. If so, it ought not to suffice. There ought to be more expense in connection with salaries in these schools. But, after all, they were a minority, and taking it as a whole they had this tax of 19s. 5d. on sections of the Scottish people who, at the same time, paid their full amount for the general educational purposes of the country. There was a particular circumstance whereby the case for a further grant was made stronger. In the year 1890, after the English Local Taxation Acts had been passed, an equivalent grant was made to Scotland, and some £40,000 was to be devoted to education under the Education Act of 1890. After the fee grant of 1891 had been passed a sum of £265,000 was paid to Scotland for her share of the fee grant, and under a section of the Education and Local Taxation Account a certain balance was to be paid over as an extra fee grant, by means of which balance the schools got an extra grant of 2s. When the Voluntary Schools Act for England was passed in 1897 an equivalent sum had to be paid to Scotland, which on the face of it ought to have been 5s., but when the debate came on the Lord-Advocate, now Lord Dunedin, told the House that it was not intended to pay more than 3s. because the other 2s. had already been paid. Of course, that statement was canvassed by the present Deputy-Chairman of Committees, who never would allow a point of that kind relating to Scottish finance to escape him, and he challenged the Government, and the Government replied: "Well, we are really not defrauding you in any way; you have got this 2s. already," and they went on to say that Scotland would not have got that 2s. if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not promised to make it up, because the balance of the former fund would soon be exhausted. That was Scottish money to start with. But the balance was not exhausted, and it was not likely to be exhausted, because it was derived from the probate duty, which increased faster than the expenditure, and therefore there had never been any need for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make up the balance of 2s. The original position remained as it was before. There was that 2s. paid out of purely Scottish money which was devoted to the fee grant. No call had been made upon the Exchequer as was promised by Lord Dunedin, and all the same, 3s. only continued to be paid. Quite apart from the denominational point of view, there was an absolute case for an extra 2s. of fee grant following upon the English precedent of 1897 to make that sum up to 5s., and he believed this fund, so far from being exhausted, had actually been tapped and used for other purposes. He would like the Lord-Advocate to say whether that was not so, and on what ground he justified the continual withdrawal of 5s. which would have been the equivalent under the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897. He would conclude with one further appeal, which was not in a party sense at all. Here they found a number of schools doing work acknowledged to be good, on means acknowledged to be inadequate. They were educating a large section of the people of Scotland, and those representing the schools came, not to make any demand to be put on an equal footing with their neighbours, but that out of the money already assigned to Scotland some fraction should be given to those schools to enable them to continue their good work without a sense of cruel harshness and injustice.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he wished to say a few words upon this question. He did not think the Government or the House quite realised how limited and moderate was the request they were now making. He would pass by the taunt of the hon. Member who regretted that they had not fallen upon this Bill with the intention of tearing it to pieces. That would no doubt be the hon. Member's desire, but it was not their desire. All they wanted was to put forward a moderate and reasonable request, and he asked the representatives of Scotland sitting on the Treasury bench, and particularly the Secretary of State for War, to listen to him for two or three moments while he put this point. The Secretary for Scotland in his speech had stated that he had dealt with the issues raised. He respectfully submitted to the right hon. Gentleman that three-fourths of his speech was not devoted to the real issue, because he dealt mainly with the question of no rates going to voluntary schools. That, however, was not the point he and those who thought with him had raised. They had their own views upon that point as to the injustice of the present system, but they had not raised the point in this debate. Their point was disposed of by the right hon. Gentleman in a very few words, and he respectfully submitted to him that it deserved a more serious consideration. This new Scottish Education Fund was to be allocated under Clause 15 in a particular way. There were three or four subsections stating how the money was to be spent, and the clause went on in subsection (2) to provide that after those payments the balance was to be distributed in a certain way in accordance with a scheme of allocation prepared by the Department. What they asked for was that the admitted deficiency in the amount which went to voluntary schools should be met, as far as possible, out of the surplus under Clause 15. The right hon. Gentleman said that that surplus would to some extent have the effect which they desired. He also said that careful calculations made by him enabled him to give the House an assurance that every class of schools, and every individual school would derive benefit from the allocation of this surplus. Was it an unreasonable thing for them to ask the right hon. Gentleman to let them see his calculations in order that they might form some independent judgment of their own as to what the effect of the distribution of that surplus would be? The right hon. Gentleman said he could not give the figure. He knew he could not give an absolute figure, because nobody could tell the precise amount, but surely he could take the House of Commons into his confidence and allow them to form a judgment upon his own calculation, and if it showed that a substantial increase of the amount received by the denominational schools would result it would very largely meet the point they had made. If the right hon. Gentleman could show the House that this would be a genuine surplus, and that out of it an appreciable improvement in the position of voluntary schools would arise, it would meet their point to a very large extent, even if the Government were not able to put into the Bill, which he thought they ought to, a statement that out of that surplus a certain definite sum should be given in aid of the voluntary schools. On the justice of the matter alone, without going into the question of rates, it was not fair that voluntary schools should receive 25s. a year per head of the scholars less than other schools. On the face of it, it was an unfair state of things which it would be right to remedy at once. They were not making that large claim which the hon. Gentleman combated in his speech, but they were simply making the most limited and reasonable demand. The right hon. Gentleman ought to show his calculations to the House, and put something into the Bill which would satisfy them that the voluntary schools were going to get some increased grant which would remove some of the injustice which they at present suffered. He put that point as a reasonable request. They did not want to embark on a bitter controversy over this matter. Those sitting on the Irish benches had experienced unpleasantness and bitterness in connection with the English education discussions, and they did not want to introduce them into Scotland. They were dealing there with a state of peace, and the Government ought to allow this small recognition of the justice of their claim to be made. Although it might not satisfy the full demands of justice, he thought that at any rate it would prevent a still greater sense of injustice rankling in the mind of the Catholic people of Scotland. In fairness to the interests they represented, and in fairness to the House of Commons, he appealed to the Government to give them this further concession.

Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) said he approached this question entirely from an educational standpoint. It had been admitted that the grant to the special schools in Scotland, including the Catholic and Episcopalian, was less than two-thirds of the grant given to other schools. The only result of that must be to starve the teachers, because it was impossible to expect young men to devote themselves to teaching when they would only receive two-thirds of the salaries paid to their brother teachers in other schools. It had been stated by hon. Members from Ireland that Catholic schools generally were as good as board schools and similar institutions. [A Nationalist Member: Yes, in proportion to their means.] Nothing had been more painful to him, representing as he did a working men's constituency, than to see the way in which poor Catholic children went out into the world uneducated and were driven down to the ranks of the daily labourer. He was convinced that a large portion of the unemployed of to-day were poor Irish Catholics. That was the reason he made a special and urgent appeal to those representing Scotland on the front bench to remember that by this measure they were doing an injury to the poorest of the poor. Those poor men belonged to a religion which did not possess a wealthy class in a position to contribute funds to make up the difference between the 40s. and the 65s. grant, and they had to depend entirely on the pence of the poorest of the poor. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to recognise that if the salaries of teachers were so greatly reduced as they necessarily would be under this Bill they could not expect good education to be given to the Catholic poor of Scotland.

*Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said the hon. Member for Waterford had stated that his hon. friend the Member for the Glasgow University entertained some hostile feeling towards this Bill. His hon. friend had been a Member of the Grand Committee upstairs which dealt with the Bill, and he felt sure that he was expressing the feelings of all those who sat on that Committee when he said that those representing the Opposition side of the House had shown every desire to facilitate the passage of the Bill and had not indulged in any unnecessary or discursive talk calculated to hinder its passage. On the contrary, they had always pronounced themselves favourable to the general principles of the Bill. In some given particulars they differed and would like to see them altered. His hon. friend had stated that some of the previous speakers did not appear to have urged their case with the necessary vigour to move the Front Government Bench. Speaking with some knowledge and experience he could assure the hon. Member for Waterford that he would get nothing out of the front bench whatever unless he displayed some vigour in attack. The Roman Catholic question had been dealt with fully and admirably in previous speeches, and in what he had to say he did not propose to deal with one creed more than another. The voluntary schools of Scotland were not composed entirely of Roman Catholics; they were composed largely of children of very different creeds indeed, but they all suffered from the injustice that they were called upon to contribute to the rates and did not get an adequate return for their own system of education. He did not deny that the Roman Catholic case was a very clamant one. There were 100,000 children in their schools, and while the parents had to contribute largely to the rates they had to provide their own school buildings. The House had had a revelation from the hon. Member for East Clare, when he stated that he and the Secretary for Scotland *arcades ambo* spent three weeks on the moors of Dunbartonshire whispering soft nothings to one another. Knowing the persuasive manner of the hon. Member for Clare and knowing also the facility with which Members of the Front Bench made election-pledges, which might or might not be carried into effect, he had not so much fear for the Roman Catholic schools in Scotland as for the general religious liberties of that country. It was with respect to the other schools that he was concerned. He wished to plead for justice and efficiency. Could they have efficient education in Scotland in cases where there was not sufficient money? Were the board schools extravagantly managed? The Government said they were not. They were allowed a certain sum of money that was necessary for providing efficient education. The voluntary schools were asked to provide the same education with about 25s. per child less. If they were to do so they must economise by paying smaller salaries to the teachers and by starving the educational service in other ways. The right hon. Gentleman had tried to console the House by stating that the voluntary schools would be better off in the future than in the past. He said he had given the whole matter his careful consideration. What did he mean by that? He presumed that he would be furnished with a rough estimate from those who were capable of giving information on the subject. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman give an outline of the information to which he had given his careful consideration? He was prepared to take the right hon. Gentleman's careful consideration for what it was worth, but he wished to know what had led the right hon. Gentleman to the conclusion at which he had arrived. It was true that there would be increased grants, but the greater obligations were greater than the increased grants. He quite agreed that they could not give rate aid without popular control, but if the educational efficiency of a large section, about one-ninth, of the Scottish population was to suffer for the want of the small additional sum of money which was asked he urged that, whether the schools were Roman Catholic or those of other creeds, the Government should give the matter further consideration. This was a question which excited considerable feeling in Scotland, and the Government should take some steps to provide further money with a view to the efficiency of the education given in the voluntary schools.

*MR. STEWART (Greenock) supported the appeal to the Government made from the front Opposition Bench, stating that he did so without any party prejudice or feeling in the matter. He did not look at this question from the Catholic or the Episcopalian point of view. He could not support the contention that in the fullest sense of the term these were voluntary schools, but from public moneys they received 25s. per child in attendance less than the board schools. His point was this. An Act must be supposed to presume and to intend the incidence of that Act. He would not challenge the statement of the Secretary for Scotland that the Act establishing the school system was in itself undenominational. But the effect of the Act was to give localities a system which ensured that a denominational school board might have control of the schools, and the result was that in 99 cases out of 100 the boards were denominational. They were in effect Presbyterian boards giving Presbyterian teaching to Presbyterian children. That being the case it must be assumed that the Act was meant to give facilities to Presbyterian education. He cared not whether the money had come out of the rates or taxes, the salient fact was that the whole of the religious teaching in the board schools had been paid for at the expense of the community as a whole, including Catholics. Was that just? In his judgment it was not just, and he joined hon. Members below the gangway in urging the Government to give the matter further consideration. He could not see that there was any principle involved in the question whether the voluntary schools should contribute 25s., 20s., or 15s. He did not think that the additional grant of 10s. which was asked for was excessive under the circumstances. They would still be laying on the very poorest members of the community—he cared not what their religion was—the burden of conscience to maintain the public schools as well as their own teachers and their own schools. An attempt was made to raise this question in Committee, but it was ruled out of order. He believed that a promise was given that it would be considered at a later stage of the proceedings. He asked the Government not to draw too rigid a line on this point.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) supported the appeal which had been made from both sides of the House that the Government should reconsider this point. He asked the Government to keep carefully before them two points. The first was the plea of justice. What was the answer to that plea? By setting up school boards, which provided a system which was no doubt denominational, they said to the ratepayers generally: "You must pay rates, you must endow our religion, and if you do not wish to have that we shall give you a small sum in aid of your own schools." The Government did not take up the position of saying that if the Roman Catholics did not avail themselves of the national schools they would not get any grants for their own schools. They said: "Go on with your own schools and comply with a certain standard." How did they enable them to do that? He supposed that the Secretary for Scotland was correct in saying that the voluntary schools would be better off than before and that the grants would be more generous. But that would not enable him to go before his constituents and justify his action if he were to vote for giving 25s. per child more to schools of his own denomination than to schools of other denominations. The right hon Gentleman had not shown on what principle he had acted in giving a few shillings more to the board schools than to the voluntary schools while insisting in both cases on equally efficient education. He defied any Scottish Member on the front bench opposite to defend that on the plea of justice. The next point was that of the inefficiency of the education. How could Scottish Members opposite justify themselves on that point? Efficiency must suffer unless this concession were made, and that would affect 100,000 children, or an eighth part of the children in Scotland. Were they to be told that the Government were going to allow this last opportunity to pass of improving the educational efficiency of those children? Yet the decision of the Government must mean want of efficiency in the education of those children, and that must call for the most earnest consideration of every man interested in education. He appealed to the Secretary for Scotland to respond to the reasonable plea made to him. It must be remembered that these were the children of the poorest of the poor in Scotland, of parents who were paying rates for the working of the schools by which the whole population of Scotland was benefited, and who had done more than their fair share in maintaining educational efficiency in their own schools. It might be said that these Catholic parents might send their children to the national schools, but he would ask whether any hon. Member opposite would send his children to a Catholic school? If the Government could not find the £20,000 or £30,000 to secure the efficiency of an eighth part of the children in Scotland they would incur a moral opprobrium that they had now no idea of.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that the particular question raised by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford introduced a subject which had ranged rather wide. But as a matter of fact the point they were discussing was very limited. It was really as to whether within the limits of the Education (Scotland) Fund they could carry out what the hon. and learned Member wished, viz., to give a grant of 10s. per head to the children in average attendance at Catholic schools and so secure what, in his opinion, would be a more equitable distribution of that fund. He hoped that hon. Members who had not been through the discussions on the Bill in Committee would realise that that sum was limited. The last paragraph of Clause 15 of the Bill relating to the distribution of the Residue Grant, laid down the principle on which was distributed the residue of the Education (Scotland) Fund, and that residue was arrived at by the subtraction, in the first place, of the national charges, and, in the second place, of the district charges from the fund. The hon. and learned Gentleman proposed that from that residue, before the ultimate distribution, a sum of 10s. per head should be taken and distributed to the voluntary schools. Taking 100,000 children as the right calculation of the children in the voluntary schools, that meant that they were to take £50,000 from the present distribution of the Education (Scotland) Fund to the board schools and distribute it to the voluntary schools. The result would be that they would leave all the board schools in a considerably worse position than at the present time. It was not possible for the Government to accept the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman. What he wished again to point out to the House was that the voluntary schools would be better able, after the Bill was passed, to discharge all their increased responsibilities than they were at present. The hon. and learned Gentleman would remember that on many points they had placed the voluntary schools of Scotland at an advantage in the Bill, in respect to the supply of books and medical inspection.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): Was not that in the option of the school boards?

Mr. SINCLAIR: They are exactly on the same footing as the board schools.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: Where is the advantage?

Mr. SINCLAIR said the advantage was that the school boards had at the present time no power whatever to supply books or medical inspection to the voluntary schools. That was a most distinct advance in the position in which this Bill placed the voluntary schools of Scotland. From one end of the Bill to the other no desire had been manifested but to treat the children of the voluntary schools fairly. But when they came to the distribution of this fund it was not possible for the Government, according to the Scottish system of education, to grant the suggestion made by the hon. and learned Gentleman. He could assure the hon. and learned Gentleman that the balance of the fund to be distributed according to the last part of Clause 15 would considerably increase—by at least one-half—the distribution now made to the voluntary schools under the heading of Aid Grant, and that every school in Scotland would find itself better equipped than it was at present.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give an approximate figure. The right hon. Gentleman said that this residue grant would increase by half the particular grant, which he believed was 3s. 6d. per head.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he put it at 4s. He did not want to pin himself to any particular figure less than that. He believed it would be more.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he wanted to understand. Did the right hon. Gentleman say that the position of the voluntary schools would be improved by the distribution of the residue grant to the extent of 4s. or 6s.?

MR. SINCLAIR said his statement was that it was impossible for the Government, in accordance with the Scottish system of education, to do anything by way of preference to the voluntary schools. What he anticipated was that the voluntary schools and the board schools would be placed in a better position to the extent he had mentioned. Within the limits he had stated, not by way of preference but by way of equal treatment, every school in Scotland would receive, instead of the aid grant per head of 4s. at the present time, an aid grant of 6s. per head, which would place them in a considerably more substantial position to meet the increased charges that would have to be met. He gave that to the House as the nearest approximation that they could arrive at at the present time. He would again point out to the critics of the Bill that the sum that would be left of the Residue Grant must be subjected to the subtraction for national and district charges, and that therefore it was impossible to give more out of that sum than he had stated. However, he would give an undertaking that if the sum he had mentioned was not reached it should be made up to it.

SIR HENRY CRAIK asked, if the aid grant went in a much larger proportion to the board schools than to the voluntary schools, would a similar advantage not still accrue to the board schools?

MR. SINCLAIR: No; there will be no preference in this matter.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he did not know whether he ought not to apologise for rising to take part in a Scottish debate, but as some of his co-religionists were interested in voluntary schools in Scotland he would like to know what was really the position in regard to them. One had a feeling that notwithstanding the kind expressions which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had used on this subject, little or nothing was to be done for the voluntary schools in Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he could do nothing in the way of preferential treatment for voluntary schools in Scotland. They did not ask that there should be preferential treatment of voluntary schools; they were a very long way off getting anything like preferential treatment, or even equal treatment, and it was because they recognised that that they asked that something more should be done than had been done to make it possible for these schools to carry on their work. The hon. Members below the gangway had admirably put the case before the House, and his hon. friend in front of him had argued very strongly and ably on behalf of something approaching equality of treatment under this clause. It was all the more to his credit that his hon. friend had done this, because those who were specially interested in the voluntary schools were not co-religionists of his own, and therefore there was nothing selfish on his part. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he was giving, and would give, sympathetic treatment, and, apparently, sympathy was the only thing they could get, but they wanted something more. It was not enough to say he would consider this subject or would continue to consider it, because, in the meantime, those who were responsible for the continuance of these schools were under very great disabilities in maintaining the inalienable right of children to be brought up in the religion of their parents. At the present moment the disadvantage under which these schools laboured constituted more or less starvation, and they had only to consider the figures which had been placed before them that afternoon to realise what the sense of the burden must be upon the managers of these schools, when they had to meet an expense of 23s. or 24s. per head of the children in average attendance, year by year, in order that the education which they valued, and rightly valued, for their children should continue to be given. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that if this subject was efficiently dealt with from their standpoint in Scotland, the result would be to break up the educational peace which so admirably obtained in the country. He did not think that that was a very strong argument, when it was realised that it was those who laboured under a disadvantage who were mainly responsible for that peace. It did not appear that a great deal of credit attached to the Scottish Office and their official administration of educational affairs in Scotland. He thought it was extremely likely that the peace would be broken. He could not see that a large number of persons who at present paid twice over should for ever be content to labour under these disadvantages attaching immediately and closely to their religious beliefs and conscientious views. They came to the right hon. Gentleman merely asking for reasonable consideration and he said they were not entitled to ask for the rates on behalf of the voluntary schools of Scotland. They did not ask for the rates, but for some consideration towards these men who contributed to the rates, and that 10s. per head should be placed at the disposal of the managers of these schools. They did not ask for their share of the rates, although the voluntary school managers and parents of all the children paid the rates; but they asked that some sympathy should be shown for the double sacrifice which they were at present making and that some small contribution not exceeding 10s. a head should be made. Reference had been made to the position of school boards with regard to this subject. Hitherto minorities had had a chance of having a voice in the management of these things, and he supposed also a voice in the distribution of the residue, after the payment of certain charges upon the schools, but now that was to be taken away from them. They had heard that afternoon of a school board consisting almost entirely of Roman Catholics, and some Presbyterians, and apparently upon that board presently they would have no cumulative vote to secure the presence of Presbyterians. That power was to be taken away; and in the other case, where the majority was vastly Presbyterian, Baptists, or Roman Catholics, or Episcopalians, would be handed over to the tender mercies of the majorities of the school boards. Their representation on the board was taken away from them, and no equivalent was given to them. In Scotland, at such a moment, it seemed doubly necessary that some step should be taken to qualify this sense of wrong. That there would be a sense of wrong there was no doubt where the minorities failed to find seats upon the boards. It was his privilege to be a member of a school board, and he remembered very well that they had a Roman Catholic on that board and how excellently they got on together. It was an extremely difficult board to work, on account of the religious differences which prevailed, but they worked well together. Would the right hon. Gentleman add to that sense of wrong, which was a great step towards the breaking of the educational peace in Scotland, without in any sense granting any practical expression of sympathy, in the form of an additional grant towards these schools? There was no charge of inefficiency brought against these schools. They had had hitherto to meet this danger, difficulty, and cost, and they would have to go on doing it, he supposed, although it was extremely doubtful if they could. It was hardly the policy of the Education Board of Scotland to starve these schools, but if they did, there could be no doubt that the educational peace upon which the right hon. Gentleman congratulated the House was not likely long to be maintained. Then the school managers would now doubtless have to provide their books. He knew the right hon. Gentleman said that that had been done by the board schools. Yes, but if they lost the representation on the school boards who was to say whether the claims of the voluntary schools for the free grant of these books would be allowed or not? He thought it extremely likely that when their representatives were not present they would not only be absent in body but out of mind, and the boards would not see the necessity for providing funds in order that the free grant of books might be made, so that the children and the managers of these voluntary schools would have that little modicum of assistance taken away. There was also this consideration, that while these voluntary schools had to provide for the pensions of their teachers, they were also called upon to provide for the pensions of teachers in the board schools. No contribution was made by the school boards towards the pensions of the teachers in the voluntary schools, but the managers of the voluntary schools had to pay for the pensions in the board schools. There, again, was the gravest injustice to the voluntary schools of Scotland. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to give them something more than a sympathetic treatment of the proposal made by his hon. friend below the gangway, and that something really might be done in order to avoid the starvation out of existence of many of these schools. They knew quite well that the Roman Catholics did not give up their schools. All credit to them for the way in which they had kept their schools since 1870 in England and Scotland. They had never parted with a single school, although his own co-religionists had done so from time to time, worse luck. But the pertinacity and generosity which Roman Catholics had manifested in regard to their schools constituted a very great claim upon the Secretary for Scotland, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not ignore that claim from a practical point of view, or hold over their heads as an apparent threat that there would be some breaking of the educational peace, if they endeavoured to force his hands in connection with this work.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) wished in a very few words to express on behalf of Members on those Benches their profound dissatisfaction with the second statement of the Secretary for Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman's case was sufficiently bad so long as he refused his calculations as to what the voluntary schools would obtain under the section, but now it was worse. An hon. friend who sat on the Grand Committee told him that during the whole time this clause was under discussion, the Secretary for Scotland was either unable or refused to give any calculations whatever. There was one feature of the debate which must have impressed any fair-minded man, viz., that not a single speaker who had intervened in it, from whatever quarter of the House he had come, had given any support to the proposals of the Government. Perhaps if the right hon. Gentleman did not put on the Party whips he might not be able to get a majority, as there was a unanimous condemnation of the niggardly policy by which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be endeavouring to spoil what might be a good Bill. The Secretary for Scotland had said that the voluntary schools were going to gain many advantages. A Memorandum circulated by the Catholic bishops contained a tabulated statement of the advantages which the voluntary schools were going to gain. The grievance that existed before this Bill, as between the voluntary and the board schools, was the gap of 25s. per head which the parents of the children in the voluntary schools had to pay in order to bring those schools up to the level of efficiency of the board schools. If the argument of the Scottish Secretary proved anything, it proved that these schools were still to be starved, and if that was so it was no defence to the attitude of the Government. The hon. Member who moved the Motion asked for a definite statement from the Government that there should be an increased grant and a consequent diminution of the gap between the voluntary and the board schools. His hon. friend asked for 10s., and the Secretary for Scotland said he was going to get 2s. That was put forward as a concession. It was nothing of the kind. It was the suggestion that had been discussed when the Bill was in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman had been uninfluenced by the discussion that day, and had ignored the views of every unofficial Member of the House who had spoken. In many respects the Bill was a good one, and he hoped the Chief Secretary for Ireland would read it and take it to heart, and introduce a Bill with similar provisions for the feeding and medical inspection of the children of Ireland. So far as the financial provision was concerned it was a niggardly Bill, and if they wanted to test the feeling of the House with regard to it, let the Government leave the decision to the House and not put up the Government Whips to tell.

MR. SINCLAIR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 364.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan

Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon.Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gilhooly, James
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Guinness,Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kerry, Earl of
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renwick, George
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Snowden, P.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Boland and Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh.

Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be re-committed to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills in respect of Clause 15."

The House divided :—Ayes, 103 ; Noes, 207. (Division List No. 365.)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon. SirH
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn. J.(Birmingh'm
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gilhooly, James
Glover, Thomas
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Guinness, Hon.R. (Haggerston)
Guinness,W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)

Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kerry, Earl of
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wardle, George J.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Boland and Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. S. (Pancras, W.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis, William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset. N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Bill, as amended, considered.

MR. SINCLAIR moved a clause providing for the establishment of hostels for junior students, bursars, or other pupils attending intermediate or secondary schools. This clause, he hoped, was practically agreed. It was designed to help the provision of lodgings for pupils, and it would be very useful in the Highland and country districts generally. The question has been discussed in Grand Committee, though not at very great length, and he had undertaken to consider the point and put down a clause. He begged to move.

New clause—

" A committee on secondary education, or a school board having the management of an intermediate or secondary school, may, with the consent of, and subject to any conditions prescribed by, the Department establish, maintain, and manage or combine with another or other committees, school boards, or other bodies in establishing, maintaining, and managing a hostel or hostels for junior students, bursars, or other pupils attending intermediate or secondary schools. The scale of charges for residence and otherwise in connection with any such hostel shall from time to time be so adjusted as to defray as nearly as may be the expenditure in connection therewith not otherwise provided for, provided that a deficit occurring in any year, notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the Department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds. Any committee, school board, or other body as aforesaid may, with the consent of the Department, accept and hold any gifts of property for the purposes of this section.' "—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)—

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

*MR. COCHRANE said it was somewhat inconvenient that this clause should appear on the Paper for the first time that day. Through some mistake he had not received his Papers until midday, and he had only an opportunity of glancing at the clause. In the circumstances he would ask the right hon. Gentleman to give them some further explanation of what was exactly meant by " hostel." Did it mean practically a boarding-house for students of both sexes? Would it be under the supervision of the schoolmaster and schoolmistress, or matron, or supervisor, and what arrangements were contemplated for the accommodation of the pupils? These were pertinent questions relating to points which he thought should have been fully discussed in Grand Committee. He did not say that he was opposed to the idea, but they could not point to any existing hostel maintained in a manner similar to that now proposed in any part of the United Kingdom. There was one example, as the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire could point out, where a benefactor had provided accommodation at his own expense, very generously and very properly; but to say that the school board was to set up a hostel seemed to him to be a very strong order, and deserved more full consideration than the Grand Committee had been able to give to it. He invited attention to the concluding part of the clause, which said—

> "The scale of charges for residence and otherwise in connection with any such hostel shall, from time to time, be so adjusted as to defray as nearly as may be the expenditure in connection therewith not otherwise provided for, provided that a deficit occurring in any year, notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the Department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds."

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already pointed out that the proviso cannot form part of the clause. It would mean an increased grant, according to the adjustment of the funds, from the existing education rates. That can be dealt with in Committee, but not on the Report stage. I understand that the Minister in charge does not propose to include that proviso.

MR. SINCLAIR said he proposed the clause without the proviso.

*MR. COCHRANE said he was really most grateful to Mr. Speaker for pointing out to him where they had gone wrong. No one could have told from anything the right hon. Gentleman had said that he proposed to move the clause in any other form than that in which it appeared on the Paper. Under the circumstances, he would really ask the Government to deal with this matter in a separate Bill at some future time. The right hon. Gentleman had brought before them a proposal which was absolutely unconsidered, though he said he had given it careful consideration, but that careful consideration had not even brought the clause within the Orders of the House. The Secretary for Scotland was supposed to keep them on the right lines; yet at the very last moment, on the Report stage, he came forward with a proposal, a most important part of which had to be cut out. How did the right hon. Gentleman propose to make up the deficit? If he could not make it up surely the clause would be rather inoperative. While he was not prepared to deny that there might be something in the general idea of hostels, he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that that was not the proper opportunity for considering this particular scheme, and that it should be withdrawn and brought up in some other form.

MR. SINCLAIR said he thought this a very harmless clause. In the form in which it was now moved, in which it imposed no charge on public funds, he thought the House might be disposed to consider whether it would not be well to add it to the Bill at this stage.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: On a point of order, may I ask if the omission of the proviso does not leave it as a necessary result that this clause will involve a charge on the rates? Is it therefore in order at this point that such a clause should be introduced?

*MR. SPEAKER: The insertion of the proviso certainly would leave the clause making a charge on the rates.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): May I refer to the preceding words—

> "So as to defray as nearly as may be the expenditure."

It does not propose, therefore, that the hostel shall cover its own expenses. Are not these words also out of order?

*MR. SPEAKER: Certainly. As I understand certain duties are imposed on the committees on secondary education. They have certain funds placed at their disposal by the Bill. This clause, without the proviso, would enable them to employ these funds for the purpose of establishing hostels. That, of course, they can do. But the proviso goes on to say in the event of those funds being insufficient the deficit will be made up out of a public charge. That cannot be done on Report. The other part can be done on Report.

MR. SINCLAIR said he would continue his observations on the light of what the Speaker had said. This was merely to meet the convenience of parents who had to send their children some distance to attend secondary schools. That was a common thing in the country districts of Scotland, and in the Highlands and other parts it was found very difficult for parents to arrange for the proper and convenient lodging of their children. By this clause they wished to give power to the secondary education committee, or as the case might be to the school board, which provided the secondary school, to see to it that the lodging of these children was conducted and maintained and managed under proper regulations with due regard to every interest of the children. That was all that was implied by the clause. It gave power where they could to make suitable arrangements, and establish lodgings under supervision, to which parents would be in no sense reluctant to send their children. It would be convenient for ordinary pupils attending secondary schools and junior student centres where young people were trained for going through their preliminary education for the profession of teaching. This was a provision which was much desired and would be of great convenience in many districts in Scotland. The question remained whether or not it would be carried out on business principles. It was for the committee, or the school board concerned, to decide. There was no difficulty in Scotland in adding up pounds, shillings, and pence and balancing one account against another and considering whether or not such an enterprise would be financially sound or not, but it would be left to the committee or school board to consider whether or not it would be a sound business undertaking to establish a hostel of this kind. He hoped the House would be good enough to allow the clause to pass.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the proposal might have many merits which they had not yet had time to discern. But unless it was to be absolutely nugatory they ought to have some clear idea as to where the money was to come from by which these hostels were to be provided and maintained. The hostels must first of all be built, and that would cost money. The children when they were brought there, he presumed, at their parent's expense, would have to be boarded, and that again was an item; they could not be left there without some supervision, and that was a matter which the school board would have carefully to consider and for which it would have to make adequate provision in money. Where was this money to come from? Was it to come from the pockets of the parents? Was there any reasonable probability that they would be able to meet all the items of expenditure which he had enumerated? If it did not come out of the pockets of the parents from what source was it to come? Was it to come from the fund placed at the disposal of the school board or from the rate which they must levy? If from the rate they could not but consider that the Bill as it stood laid very heavy additional charges upon the ratepayer. If it was to come from the fund the question was what other educational interests might have to go short of money because of this adventure in hostels. The whole proposal was one of great novelty. He was not aware that the experiment had ever been tried in England, although from time to time it had been recognised that establishments of this sort might be of considerable usefulness and value. But the difficulty had always been the provision of the cost. The parents were not usually able to maintain their children at a distance and to pay in addition a fair share of the cost of building and supervision, and the ratepayer would be unwilling to embark on a new experiment and at the same time to incur this charge. In the first place, the Committee upstairs ought to have had some opportunity of considering this new educational departure, and, in the second place, they ought to have some clearer understanding from the right hon. Gentleman, if these hostels were not to be a hopeless failure from the beginning, where the money was to come from to build and maintain them and provide the necessary supervision for the children.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said the clause at first sight looked of a somewhat ambitious description. He did not know whether it was the word "hostel" which was foreign to his ears, or whether it was the length of the clause. But this was a comparatively simple matter, and as it was becoming a subject of some urgency now to come to the real matter of the Bill he would endeavour to remove some of the difficulties which had been raised, which he did not think were really pertinent to the clause. What this really meant, as he understood, was that the school board having higher schools to which pupils could go from a distance, should organise lodgings for the pupils. There was no doubt that the boarding-out of the children attending the schools was a very anxious and expensive matter for the parents. If the school boards were to organise these lodgings it could be done cheaper and better. A hostel would mean a new establishment for girls and another for boys, and he did not think that would be a good arrangement or an economical one. He would dismiss that altogether from his mind. The children would be far better lodging with families, and he thought the scheme ought to be self-supporting. It was very simple and it might very well be adopted, and he did not know if they discussed it upstairs that they could throw much more light on it.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said the right hon. Gentleman said the question had been discussed fully in Committee. He found from the report that it was moved at the end of a very long sitting, on the last day, when about half-a-dozen new clauses were discussed, and the result was that after it had been moved the clause was withdrawn. He had no recollection of its being discussed at all. It must have been discussed in one or two minutes, and withdrawn at the request of the right hon. Gentleman himself. Now, without any notice, they had this very important clause introduced for the first time. What proposal did the right hon. Gentleman make to remedy any error that might be committed? He said there might be other opportunities in the course of the Bill. The Third Reading was to be taken that night. Were they at four or five o'clock to be discussing corrections of things that they had done in haste and unwisely at seven? Or was it that the right hon. Gentleman had again referred to another place? It was all very well to say that this was an innocuous and innocent clause. Had it ever been laid on the school boards that they should be turned into hotel-keepers and establish boarding-houses? The hon. Member for Leith Burghs was in favour of its being self-supporting, but were any of these things self-supporting for long? Was it not more than likely that there would be extravagance and that they would have to come upon the rates after all? The only funds in the hands of school boards were those derived from rates, and if there was a deficit it must come out of the rates. Was it wise or reasonable at one swoop to introduce this new power? No doubt hostels were very useful, but they ought not to allow a public benefaction to be made an indirect cause of throwing a burden upon the rates. By all means let them make full use of these benefactions and endowments, but they ought not to make them an excuse for throwing an additional burden upon the rates. A change of this kind ought to be done calmly and after due deliberation, because it was the most dangerous of all legislation to alter an Act of Parliament extending the powers put upon local authorities to meet a single case in Dumfriesshire. Was it reasonable or proper simply to meet a case of this kind that they should be asked in a hurry to change fundamentally the functions of local bodies spread over the whole of Scotland? Why should they be asked in this way to accept a clause which was laid aside at the request of the right hon. Gentleman himself and which would most probably impose a heavy burden upon the ratepayers?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington) invited the House to come to a conclusion upon this very small point. The hon. Member opposite had addressed the House at considerable length although the question before them was a very short one indeed. This clause imposed no financial responsibility or liability on the rates in the form in which it stood. It dealt with the school boards, which were statutory bodies, and without such a clause it would not be proper for them to enter even into a voluntary arrangement, It might be that voluntary arrangements would be entered into by private co-operation which would involve no charge and yet make these institutions work perfectly well. The case was safeguarded from every point of view because it could not be done without the consent of the Education Department. It was absurd to suggest that there was any danger in passing this clause. To deprive those bodies of a provision of this kind would be to deprive them of powers which might be found useful to meet a case which was well-known, and which they were all desirous of meeting if they could. It was a very small point, simply intended to give those statutory bodies power to enter into voluntary arrangements of this kind, and he invited the House to come to a conclusion upon this matter.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said he was surprised the right hon. Gentleman had made that speech. Certain powers were wise and necessary in some cases, but in this case public bodies were to be allowed to embark in this business and yet they were not to be permitted to charge the rates with any loss that might be incurred. How could anybody tell whether a hostel was going to result in a loss or not? The right hon. Gentleman was offering those public bodies powers upon conditions under which they could not possibly use them. They ought to allow the erection of hostels or lodging-houses upon one condition only, and that was that the school board should be entitled to charge upon the rates any deficiency or loss caused by running them. Without such power no hostel would ever be erected. One benefactor had left £1,000 to work a hostel, but why should they ask that school board to take over that lodging-house without giving them the power to use the rates for the purpose? He thought that was perfectly absurd. If the Government wished to meet the demands of Dumfriesshire, they must empower the school board to run the hostel. The Government were proposing a clause under which hostels might be taken over, but the school boards would have no power to pay the deficiency unless they did so out of their own pockets. The right hon. Gentleman was not helping them at all in this matter, because under the guise of assisting the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire he was bringing forward an ill-considered clause. There was nothing whatever to recommend this clause to the House, and if carried the people of Dumfriesshire would be no further forward.

*MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) said that a clause on this subject was moved in Committee, and at the request of the Secretary for Scotland, who gave a promise that he would reconsider it, he withdrew. His right hon. friend was now keeping his promise, and he thanked him most heartily for doing so. A house had been given in Dumfries, and £1,000 had been left to keep up that house, and the school board could not assume responsibility for its management without this clause. Under their present system, children were coming in from the country districts, and were being encouraged to do so by the Education Department in order to obtain the best possible education. Many of them were junior students, young people of both sexes, who, by the new regulations, were forced to come into Dumfries. Others were the holders of bursaries under the encouragement of the Department, and this clause would empower the county committees of Dumfriesshire and Kircudbrightshire, with the co-operation of the school board of Dumfries, to take over this building and run it as a hostel for these young people. He put it to the House whether it was not better that these pupils should live together under proper supervision than go to lodgings all over the town. The power contained in the clause was necessary in order to carry that scheme out. He was sorry a provision to meet the deficit was not possible, but even short of that the committee would probably be able to run this hostel on its own legs. Many parents had already expressed their willingness to add something to the bursaries in order that their children might be properly housed, and he appealed to hon. Members from Scotland to meet this special case of Dumfries, and encourage the generosity of other benefactors. He appealed to the House to allow this clause to go through.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said the speech made by the Secretary of State for War was most unfair and uncalled for, and one which he was sure in his moments of reflection he would regret. No one was entitled to speak with more authority on this subject than his hon. friend sitting near him. Not only were his hon. friend's remarks not at undue length, but they were necessitated by the fact that the Government had adopted a procedure which had landed the House in the circumstances in which they now found themselves. The Secretary for Scotland had moved a new clause which was not on the Paper, and it was somewhat difficult for the House to judge how the removal of the proviso had affected the rest of the clause. He asked the serious attention of the House to this matter. He was just as anxious as the hon. Member for Dumfries that the munificent liberality of the gentleman who had been named should be taken full advantage of, but that was no argument for rushing through a clause which involved their embarking upon a financial path which might be very dangerous. He asked the Secretary for Scotland who in the event of a deficit was going to pay? Under the clause, the school board or the education committee were to take charge, but were the Government going to make any other provision? If so, they could not do it in this House, and he did not think it could be done in the other House. He submitted that, anxious as they all were to give effect to the wishes of the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, it was not right that it should be done at a possible cost to the Exchequer which had not been sanctioned by Parliament. If the Secretary for Scotland could give them some explanation of the provision he was going to make and the source from which he proposed to draw the amount required to meet any possible deficit, their proceedings would be very much simplified and shortened.

SIR GEORGE McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) thought it would be necessary for the right hon. Gentleman to alter his Amendment somewhat, because he was providing for the authority creating a deficit year by year. It would be found necessary to strike out the words "as nearly as may be," otherwise the clause was nonsense. He commended that point to his right hon. friend.

MR. SINCLAIR said the omission of the proviso had put upon them the necessity of omitting the words referred to by the hon. Member for East Edinburgh. That included his answer to the question put by the hon. member for North West Lanarkshire. As the clause now stood these institutions would be self-supporting, and in that form he, on behalf of the Government, asked the House to accept the clause.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said he accepted the explanation. If the right hon. Gentleman had given it before he should not have thought it necessary to ask the question.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said they were told that when the proper time came some Amendments would be moved. After that announcement they were informed by the Secretary of State for War that the clause would not mean any charge upon anybody, and that right hon. Gentleman advised the House to pass it without discussion. Then the hon. Member for East Edinburgh informed the House that unless certain words were omitted the clause would be nonsense, whereupon the Secretary for Scotland got up and moved another Amendment, which not a single Member of the House had the slightest idea was going to be moved. They were entitled to ask how many more Amendments were going to be moved. At present they did not know what they were going to vote upon. They had been told that there would be two substantial Amendments and there might be others. He did not understand the Secretary for Scotland when he said that no charge was going to be imposed in view of the words in the proposed clause—

> "Provided that a deficit occurring in any year, notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the Department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds."

The right hon. Gentleman had made a mistake, and he presumed he would now advise the House not to vote for the clause. He asked the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs to reconsider his position. The hon. Member said he did not know the meaning of the word "hostel." It was an old English word which meant "hotel." He said that the result would be that the education committee or school board would arrange lodgings in the town.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said that what he stated was that he did not understand the word "hostel" so far as this clause was concerned. He said that what was really wanted was that the education committees should keep a register of suitable lodgings where several children might lodge. He thought the clause ought to be recast with that object.

SIR F. BANBURY asked the hon. Member to vote against the clause in order to carry out his meaning. As it stood at present it would not carry out what he desired. It gave power to these people to build houses in order that certain pupils might be lodged. He understood that the reason for the introduction of the clause was that some generous person in Dumfriesshire had given a house and £1,000. That house had to be maintained with the £1,000 and whatever other money could be found out of the rates or elsewhere. Was it not rather an extraordinary thing that because one man had been generous enough to give a house in one district the House of Commons should be asked to pass a clause which nobody fully understood, but which, so far as one could understand it, would have the effect of enabling education authorities in Scotland to start hotel keeping? He did not believe it was possible for popularly constituted bodies to run hotels economically or profitably, and he was afraid that if this clause was passed the system would be extended to England. If anyone who wished to make a name for himself established a hostel somewhere in England and a similar clause was introduced in a future Bill, they would be unable to oppose it because they would be told that it was exactly on the lines of what was going on in Scotland. The new clause said—

> "The scale of charges for residence and otherwise in connection with any such hostel shall from time to time be so adjusted as to defray as nearly as may be the expenditure in connection therewith not otherwise provided for."

What was meant by "not otherwise provided for?" Did that mean benefactions? [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.] Neither the hon. Member for Dumfries nor the Secretary for Scotland said anything, and therefore he presumed they did not know what it meant. Under the circumstances he would vote against the clause.

*MR. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire), speaking as the Member for a consti-

tuency very much interested in this question, thanked the Secretary for Scotland for having proposed the clause. It would really enable use to be made of a very patriotic benefaction. The two counties and one borough concerned in this matter were working amicably. The difficulty referred to by the hon. Member for Oxford University had been met, because in this case the hostel had been provided and a certain sum of money had been provided.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I was not alluding to one particular hostel, but to the general power proposed to be given by the clause.

*MR. MOLTENO said when he was a student at Cambridge if there was no room in the actual college buildings lodgings outside were to be had. An arrangement was made that those lodgings should be kept by persons properly qualified, and a certain charge was arranged by the college authorities. The charge was paid by the student and no charge fell on the University. Under this clause similar arrangements could be made in Scotland and no expenditure would fall on the school board. He begged the House not to put any technical difficulty in the way of this gift being availed of.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that he and his friends felt great sympathy with the two hon. Gentlemen who had spoken from the back benches on the merits of the question. He would say to some of the Ministers that the progress of the Bill would be made smoother in future if they were able to keep down the Secretary of State for War. It was most unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman did not follow his own precepts. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had addressed the House in his capacity as Secretary for War, the Member for East Lothian, or as the temporary Leader of the House. It was most unfortunate that he should have intervened and advised them to be as short as possible. They were discussing a Bill which took fifteen days upstairs, and that time had been taken not by the wicked Opposition, but chiefly by hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House. They were discussing a clause which might have been put down weeks ago, but it had been put down as an afterthought at the last minute. If passed, it would establish a precedent for that part of Great Britain called England. In the course of the discussion it had been found that it had been introduced under the most unfavourable of all circumstances for establishing a new general principle, for it had leaked out that it was for the purpose of meeting a particular hard case. He could not congratulate the Government on the course they had taken.

*MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said he wished to complain that the House of Commons were too apt to think that Scottish education was a matter of small moment, and that one day only was quite enough for its discussion. This clause alone was admitted to be a new departure of great moment and importance, yet it had been introduced without a single school board in Scotland having had an opportunity of considering it. Many thought that there were too few business men on the front bench opposite. Their conduct in this matter strongly confirmed that opinion. The words "establishing and maintaining and managing" in the clause involved cash, but he thought it was quite possible to take advantage of these benevolent institutions, and yet not to become responsible for cash. It would be quite competent for a school board to appoint some trusted and respected members of their own body and delegate to them the power to look after and manage these hostels. Later on there was a drastic clause—Clause 31—which involved surcharges, and which put a very serious responsibility on those who had been acting in good faith and who, up till now, had had immunity from such surcharges.

*SIR J. DEWAR (Inverness) said that it was a mistake to believe that Dumfries was the only district in the country where hostels were required. There were many places all over the country where hostels would be established if school boards had the necessary power. He knew of one case where the chairman of a school board had had the greatest difficulty in obtaining suitable accommodation for the pupils who came from all over the county to a secondary school in the village. It seemed to him, however, that if there was no power to make up the deficit the clause would not amount to much. There was nothing to prevent a school board at present running a hostel if they ran it at a profit, but if they ran it at a loss the members would be personally responsible and so they would be under the new conditions if this proviso was struck out. He would like to see the clause passed in its original form.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 211; Noes, 41. (Division List No. 366.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.

Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stadord, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philip
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur, Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Henry Craik and Mr. Robert Duncan.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 9, after the word 'defray,' to omit the words 'as nearly as may be.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) asked how, if these words were omitted, the lodging-house keeper was to adjust his accounts at the beginning of the year so as to be able to tell his total expenditure for "residence and otherwise in connection with the hostel," and whether there would be no loss on the transaction of the year.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot go back on the discussion on the former part of the clause.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said he was going to ask how "as nearly as may be" would affect the case brought forward. Could the right hon. Gentleman explain how it was possible for a manager of a hostel to gauge his expenses in such a way that there should be no legal disqualification at the end of the financial year supposing there was a deficit?

*MR. SINCLAIR said he should be very glad to explain. Mr. Speaker had ruled that certain words containing a proviso must be omitted as proposing a charge which could not be brought forward on Report, and to complete the omission of the proviso which those lines contained, he proposed to omit the words in line 9. Otherwise the omission of the proviso would not have its full effect. The result of the omission of these words would be to make it perfectly clear that in maintaining these hostels there must be no charge upon public funds. There might be a balance "Cr." but not a balance "Dr."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved to the proposed new clause—

"In line 11, to omit the words 'provided that a deficit occurring in any year notwithstanding such adjustment, may, with the approval of the department, be paid out of the district education fund or funds.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

*MR. GULLAND moved a new clause requiring the parents of physically and mentally defective children to provide efficient education for them up to the age of sixteen years, at the instance of a school board who made special provision for the education of such children. At present, there was no distinction in Scotland on this point between defective children and other children, and fourteen was the age up to which the school board might require attendance. In England, under the Act of 1899, these defective children must stay at school till they were sixteen. The Report of the Commission on the Feeble-minded recognised that the board should have charge of these feeble-minded children till the age of twenty-one, and as to Scotland it recognised that it should be the duty of the parent to provide elementary education, which should include the duty of causing the child to attend a class or school, up to such an age as in the interest of the child might be necessary on the report of the medical officer. This clause only gave power to make provision for these defective children up to the age of sixteen, and the boards who had furnished special facilities for the education of this class asked for it because they found that in the administration of these schools there were many defective children who were taken away at the age of fourteen who had not received the education they might have received if they had stayed another two years. The parents did not always appreciate the advantage of education, and sought to take away the children at the earliest possible moment. It seemed hard that a board like that, say, of Glasgow, who had spent so much money on defective children, should not have the full advantage of what they had done.

New clause—

"It shall be lawful for a school board which makes special provision for the education of physically and mentally defective children to require the parents of such children to provide efficient education for such children up to the age of sixteen years.'"—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Sir HENRY CRAIK most cordially sympathised with the object of this clause, but would like to have the opinion of the Secretary for Scotland upon the proposal. There was one serious objection to it, that it transferred to a school board what ought to be the duty of Parliament. Under it in future a new compulsion was to be laid upon parents. It might be very right that it should be laid upon them, and that they should be compelled to make some educational provision for these defective children up to the age of sixteen, but Parliament should have the courage of its opinions, and say so itself; it was a most unfair, unwise, and impolitic course that they should leave it to each particular school board to say what was to be the limit of a parental responsibility of this sort. Up to the present time the only authority which had imposed any duty on the parent had been that of Parliament. Were they now going to change that, and make it the function of every petty school board out of the 900 odd school boards in Scotland, to say to what extent it was the duty of a parent of a child where such mental deficiency prevailed to provide education, and to extend it from fourteen to sixteen years of age.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) inquired whether the words "provide efficient education" meant that even in the case of the poor parent the fees should be found out of the pockets of the parents.

Mr. SINCLAIR replied in the negative. It meant that parents should send the children to school. He did not think this point was of very wide interest, but it was an important point so far as it went. There were certain school boards in Scotland which provided special education for children who were mentally defective, and it had been put forward by these bodies that they would be able to do much more for the children if they were able to continue their education up to the age of sixteen. These children were not to be compared with ordinary children, as they were defective and backward, and at the age an ordinary child was fit to leave school these children were not fit to do so. The clause gave power to such school boards as gave special education of this kind to require the attendance, and what was meant by the parent providing education meant that he was to cause the attendance of these children at school. He did not think the operation of the clause would be attended with anything but benefit, both to the children and to the authorities. It was only an enabling power, and therefore he suggested that the clause deserved consideration. It would bring to children who suffered from great disabilities in the battle of life a chance of better equipment, and on the whole he should advise its acceptance.

Sir HENRY CRAIK said his point had not been dealt with. It was whether, if this was to be laid upon the parent, it should not be done universally by Parliament, and not by the school board.

Mr. SINCLAIR was sorry he had not answered the point. He thought the time was hardly ripe for a general power of compulsion of this kind. In the first place there were very few school boards who had provided special schools of this kind, and he thought they would do well not to lay this burden upon other school boards who had less wealthy resources at their command than those who had made this step forward. He thought it better that they should let the matter stand as the clause provided in an experimental stage, and at a later time they might usefully advance.

Mr. CARLILE said the clause laid down that the parent should provide efficient education, but there might be such children in parts of the country where such schools were not available. Were the parents to be then called upon to provide efficient education? The right hon. Gentleman said "No," but the clause said "Yes," and they wanted the clause to be made to correspond with the right hon. Gentleman's view. The right hon. Gentleman said that it meant that the parents were only to see that their children went to such schools, but that was not what the clause said, and he thought it ought to be reconstructed in accordance with the right hon. Gentleman's statement.

MR. RAINY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said the clause was a humane one. These children learned much more slowly than ordinary children, and this represented the minimum amount of instruction that these children should have. They should be helped as much as possible. As to the objection of the hon. Member who had just sat down, it was only those children who were born or lived under a school board which could provide such education that the clause would touch. He urged the House to give these unfortunate fellow creatures all the help they could.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON, in moving a new clause (Constitution of School Board districts), said the Amendment represented very much the line which was taken on the Bill introduced by the late Government, and supported by some on the Ministerial side of the House. The question had been debated in Committee and also in Scotland, where educational opinion had been united in favour of a change of the areas. The Secretary of the Department of Education of Scotland ought to have power to consolidate educational areas without having to wait for the initiative to be taken by the local authorities. He hoped this question of areas would be dealt with, because without recasting the educational areas they were left with the Department as the controlling authority. The Bill debased the local authority, whilst it exalted the Department. Ever since the union of the Crowns, Scotland had been cursed with boards and commissions. This Bill added enormously to the force of that complaint, because confusion of authorities was perpetuated under it. Without giving greatly increased powers to the Department (and the increased powers given to the Department were the main feature of this Bill) the Bill would be absolutely unworkable. This plague of boards and commissions had risen to a mania under the present Administration, which relied on absolute bureaucracy to deal with everything, from land to education. In England the exactly opposite policy had been pursued. In England education had been co-ordinated, and the local authority had been relied on and the power of the central authority diminished. They heard protests that the policy for Scotland was no different from that of England. But they knew the voice of Jacob, and felt the hairy hand and the sandalled foot of Esau, and they knew that Esau had arrived at his present state of development because he was located in London. If he had not been located in London he would have been subjected to the living force of the opinion of Scotland. The veiled prophet of Dover House was pre-eminent among the oligarchy of eminent public servants which dominated Scottish affairs. There was no niche for that sort of autocrat in the fabric of the British constitution. He was set up because the Government perpetuated the obsolete parish areas which prevented them from co-ordinating education in Scotland. Those areas were as obsolete for the purposes of education as they were for the purposes of Poor Law, and it was because that fact was not realised by the Government that this Bill was and before very long would be proved to be a failure. It was the bogey that had been conjured up out of the last Amendment that was ruled out of order that had made the Department the more resolute to maintain its close grasp of educational matters in Scotland until one wondered that in order to carry out their views the Department had not been removed to the Scilly Isles, where it would be even more independent of the local authority. The local authority under this Bill could get no direct access to the Department. It was absolutely under the heel of the Department, and the need for recasting the areas was never more apparent than it was to-day. The Amendment explained itself, and he had no desire to take up unduly the time of the House, but believing as he did that the Department was practically free from Parliamentary control, that the little finger of the Department was thicker than the loins of any Minister, as regarded the control of education, he felt that the matter was serious. Under this Bill the post of Secretary to the Scottish Education Department would be such as had never been seen since the mayor of the palace governed the weak Merovingian King. The only way was to trust the local authority, and to restrain the heavy hand of the Department. It was idle to suppose that it could be done in any other way than by dealing with the question of areas. It was necessary to raise this question now, because it would be many years before it could again be raised. It was thirty-six years since Scotland had had an Education Bill. How long would it be before she had another? From what the Lord-Advocate expected from this Bill it might not be necessary to have another Bill for fifty years, and the local authority and the Government would be strangled upon the poles of the organisation set up in Dover House. That was the worst feature of the Bill. They were selling their birthright of free institutions for a mess of pottage.

An HON. MEMBER: Which you will not get.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON said that some thought they had got it, because a most remarkable circular had been issued by the school janitors of Glasgow, who said that now that they would get their pensions no further opposition ought to be offered to any clause in this Bill. The Bill had many provisions which were urgently required by the school boards, but the House ought to take the Bill with their eyes open. They would be responsible for the effect of the measure. He had no hesitation in saying that the Bill made for the degradation of the school boards. It degraded the school boards, and exalted the department into an oligarchy of which they had no record in the past and which he hoped would be destroyed in the future.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK said he had put down a similar Amendment to that moved by the hon. Gentleman, whose proposal he would second, though he confessed he did not quite appreciate the relevancy of the observations in which the hon. Member had submitted it to the House. The question of areas raised by the Amendment was one of the most important connected with education, though it was much more an administrative than an educational provision. He had not for his own part very much faith in the regulations which they introduced into the clauses of an Education Bill. The real education of the children must depend on the hands into which they put the schools. If they placed them in the hands of a number of small bodies scattered over a countless number of areas they inevitably lowered the scale of education given in the schools. If the schools were to be raised to their proper position it must be by putting them into the hands of a body of representatives with a constituency extending over an adequate part of the country, and with enough variety of interests to attract the best men of the district to the board. With this administrative provision of the Bill, it became ten times more necessary than even it was before that there should be an increase in the size of the areas of the country. The Bill placed in the hands of the school boards an immense amount of work that never belonged to them before. It extended enormously the range of secondary education; it extended at once the compulsory attendance from fourteen to sixteen or seventeen, and all this was put in the Bill without in the least improving and extending the character of the bodies intended to deal with the work. Not only had they failed to take the necessary step forward from the Act of 1872, but the changes which they were introducing made the areas established by that Act ten times more unsuitable than at present. Did the Government think that they were going to have the schools under the best possible arrangements by dividing them up into a number of petty atomic districts all over the country? This was the way to create a beadledom and not a sound educational system. What were the real views of those who were promoting the Bill? He was not going to reiterate that necessarily oft-repeated tale of inconsistency between former professions and later acts. He knew that the Lord Advocate might lay the flattering unction to his soul that he was faithful to the parish system. The Secretary of State for War was head of the Secondary Education Association, of which one of the foremost points was the extension of the area. But what was the reason put forward by the Secretary for War, who had followed him in the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill, as to this idea of extended areas? The right hon. Gentleman said that it might create some difference of opinion, and that the only object of the Government was to proceed along the lines of least resistance. This, the most powerful Government of modern times, was obliged from the fact that a few difficulties had arisen, and from the fact that it had to crowd the Report and Third Reading stages into one debate, to adopt its present course. He and those who thought with him were not seeking to stop this Bill; such as it was they were ready to accept it, but not to accept it at the cost of surrendering the right of Scottish Members to discuss a Bill of the very first importance to their country. When a speech was was made on that side with regard to a most important principle of the measure they were accused of trying to stop the Bill. The answer to that was the conduct of the Opposition when the measure was before Grand Committee. They had no intention of stopping the Bill; the responsibility for that rested not with them but with Ministers who curtailed the right of discussion. They put upon the school boards to a larger extent than ever before the administration of secondary education, and they were extending the range of the schools that would be under their management. How many secondary schools were there in Scotland? In round numbers only about one hundred. For the management of these one hundred schools they were establishing or keeping up nearly a thousand school boards. Was that reasonable, was it business, was it doing what was best for Scotland? They were going to encourage these petty school boards to vie with one another in attempting to establish secondary schools. A petty school board would not be content with its elementary school if in the next parish, or two or three parishes away, there was a superior school. They would run into unnecessary expenditure to raise a rival school; they would draw children into that school by various methods, not because the children wanted secondary education, but because the board wanted to make a goodly show in their own little school perhaps at the expense of the poor children who would be much better employed in beginning practical life. Let it not be thought that they were improving education by extending the period during which pupils remained at school. There was a good deal to be learned outside the school. They were running mad on this system of keeping children longer at school, in the belief that they were advancing education. There could not be a more disastrous mistake, nor one leading to greater difficulties, than to think that they would improve education by taking a larger slice out of the lives of pupils during which they were to remain within the walls of the school. They talked of the ladder of education which led a lad from the gutter to the university. It was true that this had done something for Scotland and something to affirm the glory of the parish school; but it would not be suitable to extend this idea into the far larger region of the public elementary schools. They could not do it, first of all because of the expense; and when he said expense he was not speaking of expenditure out of the rates—a far greater expenditure was the time which they took from the children. They were asking in this Bill that these petty school boards, scattered in profusion all over the country, should have power to extend compulsory education even up to the age of seventeen. But they should really stop to think a little when they were dealing with the system of an educational ladder from the gutter to the university. Let them pause to consider whether, when they shut up the children within the school walls for so long a time, they were going to have an equivalent for the time which they took from them. If children could live to the age of Methuselah—to come back a little to the illustrative methods of the hon. Gentleman opposite—perhaps it would be reasonable to take so large a proportion of their lives, but he was inclined to think that they were leaning in the direction of making too extended demands upon the time of the youth of this country, who, after the age of seventeen, perhaps, had only thirty, forty or fifty years to live. But there was another question. The Government had recognised rightly that a grievance was to be felt by the teachers. That grievance arose, they were all ready to admit, from the exercise of a sort of petty tyranny by school boards. That petty tyranny existed only amongst the smaller school boards. Was it reasonable to expect that a highly educated man, carrying on an engrossing, tiring work, which was above all things a strain on his nerves, should find it always very easy to deal with a petty board, consisting of some of the busybodies of the place, who were anxious to make his life a burden to him, to inspect every part of his work, and use less thought, and thought which came to them more rarely actually in proportion as it ought to come more frequently, who were very little fitted to judge of real questions of educational administration? The less a man was able to judge of these questions, the less experience he had had of educational administration, the more he was apt to think he could tell the teacher all that he ought to do, and that anyone who doubted his full competence to pronounce on the school curriculum was narrow-minded. He had often had to deal with these smaller school boards. He had found it possible to manage them, but it had to be done with considerable diplomacy and tact, and it was always easy to persuade them to accept what seemed to be a commonsense judgment. Over and over again when he had to deal with these small school boards, at the end of a long meeting where a majority of three put its views against a minority of two with the utmost eloquence and profusion, they generally both took him privately aside and begged of him whatever happened that he would send down from Dover House a decision one way or another, it did not matter which. They were tired of disputing, but they could not give way for personal pride, and all they wanted was a settlement and they recognised that it mattered very little which way it was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very sensible.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK asked if the hon. Member who said they were very sensible people would like to be a teacher who was exposed to the administration of these same gentlemen, every part of whose work was submitted to their microscopic criticism, and whose every personal feeling was apt to be exaggerated by perhaps unkind and inconsiderate statements on the part of this body of his masters. What was the remedy that the Bill proposed? The only remedy the right hon. Gentleman could offer to the school teacher was that there should be a sort of appeal to the Department. He did not believe an appeal to the Department was worth the paper it was written on. If the teacher appealed what would happen? He had known cases where the right was, looking at it broadly, on the side of the teacher, and he had often had reason to try to say a good word on his behalf. The extension of the areas was the very scheme proposed by the teachers themselves. But the right hon. Gentleman fell back on a worse and less efficacious remedy. The teachers admitted that the appeal was a *pis aller*, but it was not what would really satisfy them. If there was an appeal the correspondence was sent up to the Department. Would any hon. Member say if he were confined to the monotonous labour of a school teacher he would always be wise in his correspondence with the school board? Might not temper sometimes get the better of him? He had never known a case, even where he thought the teacher had very much the right on his side, where he did not find he had absolutely spoilt his case and given it away by some foolish remark. That would be the result of the appeal. It would not help the teacher at all, and if he was condemned by the Department his career as a teacher was lost for ever. But there was another subject. The hon. Member had indulged in a very picturesque denunciation of the Department. He did not quite see the relevancy to the question of the extension of the area, but after all if they were not to extend it, if they were to keep those petty boards of five people representing a mere handful of the electors, what possible resort had they but to the Department? Did they expect those 980 boards to be pioneers of education, that they were to consist of men with a full grasp of educational principle? What resort had they but to the Department? Instead of blaming the Department they ought to praise it.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON: I did not blame the Department but the system of the Bill which puts the Department in an impossible position.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said he hoped the Department had done its best to fulfil that impossible position, and if they wished to make its power vastly greater he should not regret it so much as the hon. Member, because he had the largest trust in the Department. They could do nothing better than to include within the four corners of an administrative provisions Bill, as this was, a vast extension of the powers included in it. But they devolved these upon 980 school boards, who in the vast majority of cases were *ex necessitate* incapable of doing the work that they were called upon to do, and they would, as certainly as sparks flew upwards, enormously increase the resort to the Department. They would make its interference and guidance more necessary at every corner. This whole question was the most important that had to be discussed, because it really was a question on which all their educational administration depended, and it occupied the Committee one hour and twenty minutes of which he had contributed sixteen minutes, and was greatly blamed for occupying the time of the Committee. If any absurdity in legislation could go further than that he had yet to see it. The population of Scotland was 4,500,000. The five school boards of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee, and Govan, comprised a population of 1,500,000, and they had left therefore for 967 school boards, a population of 3,000,000, or 3,000 for each school board, and an electorate of 250 or 300. Were these the bodies to which they were going to give the administration of this vastly increased educational machinery? Was it the way in which they would firmly establish their educational administrative work, and attract the wisest people? An hon. Member from Ireland had been greatly struck by the difference of opinion amongst the Scottish Members in the Grand Committee. How did the difficulty arise in regard to the money? Of course, if they had to divide it amongst 983 different bodies, when they had to dovetail a school board that was doing something for secondary education with the next which was doing nothing, and a third which sent its pupils to a fourth school board school, a great part of the Bill must have nothing to do with education and with real administration. The Bill was essentially faulty because the Government had not been able to overcome little differences of opinion. In their weakness, slackness, and want of respect for the real interest of Scotland, the Government had determined to foist upon them a Bill which was disappointing, because in previous years they had a much better Bill. He thought the House would do well to accept this Amendment, which after all only left the power in the hands of the Secretary for Scotland to act. He begged to second.

New clause—

"(1) The Secretary of Scotland may, at any time after the passing of this Act, by order, constitute school board districts as follows, and such districts shall hereafter be the districts for which school boards shall be elected, that is to say: (*a*) Each of the districts constituted, or to be constituted, in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889; (*b*) each of the counties not divided into Local Government districts; (*c*) each of the following districts, namely, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen. (2) Any question which may arise as to the county or local government district of which, for the purposes of this section, a burgh is to be deemed part shall be determined by the Secretary for Scotland, whose decision shall be final."—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) said the debate had not been without a certain amount of interest. He thought the seconder of the Amendment had most effectually demolished the mover, and he had never seen anything so effective as the hon. Member's recalling the House to the subject of the Amendment after the eloquent references to Jacob and Esau, the Scilly Islands, and other irrelevant subjects. He was not sure that his hon. friend opposite came much nearer to the Amendment himself, for he had given a variety of illustrations which hardly seemed to him to assist the House in coming to a conclusion. He thought the House would be amazed to know what was the object of this Amendment. Its object was to enable the Secretary for Scotland after the passing of this Act to set up school board districts in Scotland. The Amendment had been supported by a triumphant declaration that they were suffering from bureaucracy in Scotland. All over Scotland at any moment they were to be liable to a democratic order from the Secretary for Scotland linking up any parishes he liked. That to him seemed bureaucracy run mad, and he never heard of such a proposal, because they would never know six months in or six months out what was going to happen. The Secretary for Scotland was to be in the position, so to speak, of taking all the school board districts by the scruff of the neck and compelling them to live under one order made in the office in London. That was bureaucracy run mad, and Scotland would not stand it for a moment. The situation was most peculiar. The Amendment had been referred to in various particulars by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, who talked as if they were going to set up some grotesque and absurd machinery consisting of 100 joints in a small country with under 5,000,000 population. He said that that was what they were doing, and in that way he stated they were lowering education in Scotland. The fact was, they were doing nothing of the sort, because they were leaving the time-honoured parishes in Scotland exactly where they were when Scottish education was administered during the long term of office of the hon. Member opposite. They were altering nothing in that respect, but what they were determined to do and were going to do with great care was not to upset wantonly a scheme of education which upon the whole had had the merit of producing good educational results, and of making interest in education become at once a local widespread and national concern. Without that they could not have education thriving. If they managed the business from a central office, he agreed they would probably not get in touch with the local material. What was the Secretary for Scotland under this Amendment to do? He had to constitute school board districts, and they would, he supposed, be the districts of the counties constituted under the Local Government Act of 1889. He was more interested in regard to the situation which would be created in the outlying parts of Scotland which required to be very carefully attended to because they had not the power so effectively to look after their own interests. Take, for example, Sutherlandshire, which under the Local Government Act of 1889 was not divided into districts at all. The proposal before them was to enable the Secretary for Scotland any morning to declare the whole of Sutherlandshire a school board district, extinguishing all its parishes, although the extent of Sutherlandshire was over 2,000 square miles. He wished to put it clearly to the House: how could they expect any man in humble circumstances, and the bulk of the population of Sutherlandshire answered to that description, actively to intervene in the affairs of his county if he had to travel over such a wide extent of country at various periods of the year? The thing was absolutely impossible. What was meant in the name of objecting to bureaucracy was to establish first of all central bureaucracy which would have this tremendous power, and then either from the centre or in the districts they would effectually disestablish the interest in education which had been such a valuable asset in the progress of the country in the North. That was his answer to the Amendment. He totally objected to secondary education being charged to the parish. One of the most conspicuous provisions in this Bill was that in reference to the linking up for secondary purposes with the assistance of the committee of those outlying districts, so that parishes controlling their own educational affairs in the primary sphere might be able to select through their school boards the promising school boys and girls and send them to centres in which their secondary education would be continued under the immediate provision of the local school boards, supervised by the educational committee. For the hon. Member opposite to say that the cause of education in Scotland would be lowered by this Bill was an absolutely grotesque misapprehension of the principal object of the measure, which was to enable the whole of Scotland, including the remote districts, to retain an interest in its own education and in its promising pupils and to enable those pupils to be transferred to secondary centres such as were provided by the Bill. He admitted that the scheme under the Bill was one for the advancement of promising pupils from the humble ranks of life, enabling those in the remote parts of the country to aspire to the highest honours which a University could provide. He respectfully demurred to a policy of that kind being stigmatised as a policy from the gutter to the University. He supposed the Universities were fed by the gutter by promising pupils from outlying parishes, but although their circumstances might be humble they were the very fibre out of which their civil and military service was formed. He totally objected to language of that kind from the point of view of the University, because it appeared to be depreciating the great bulk of the democracy of Scotland. Both the mover and the seconder of this Amendment were wrong in their theory about the linking up of parishes. Under the Bill there was special provision made for the uniting of parishes and they had not left out of account the possibility of single parishes, sometimes from paucity of population or from lack of financial resource, finding that it would be a wiser policy to amalgamate with its neighbours. They had within the four corners of the Bill such a special provision as that which would remove the local difficulty to which his hon. friend had called attention. The concluding observation of his hon. friend was that this proposal was passed by in the Committee upstairs in an hour and twenty minutes, and he accused them of hurrying it. He wished to point out that if this clause were accepted the whole Bill would go, because it would knock the measure out of shape altogether by destroying parochial responsibility. It would destroy the parochial responsibility, the parochial area, and the parochial connection with the central authority, and it would set up the most capricious bureaucracy which anybody could conceive. On these grounds he said that what would be done by the Amendment was one of the most dangerous things that could be done, and that Scotland would never tolerate the idea of abandoning the system under which, notwithstanding the sneers of any person, he still maintained that Scotland had today a very fine educational result. It was out of the question for hon. Members to talk of degrading the schools and degrading the education because a system was being continued which had produced these good results.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON said he did not say so.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said he was not quoting the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs. He was quoting the hon. Gentleman opposite who said they were lowering the schools and degrading the education. He knew that the hon. Gentleman opposite was a friend of education, and that he was acquainted with many of the details in connection with education in Scotland. There were provisions in the Bill which the hon. Gentleman would admit were of enormous advantage to Scotland as a nation, and he did not think that it promoted the cause of education in that country to have it grudgingly recognised by remarks of the kind which he had made. Upon the whole, if he wanted to upset and confuse, to make involved, intricate and unhappy the relations of the school boards to the central authority, he could devise no better scheme than that of the Amendment now before the House.

Mr. H. GOOCH (Camberwell, Peckham) supported the proposal of the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs.

Until a very short time ago there was in England the very state of things which now existed in Scotland, namely, a large number of small school boards scattered up and down the country, and if there was one thing which everybody agreed in condemning it was the existence of these small boards. When they were swept away the provision by which it was done was the one portion of the Education Act which everybody approved. Under this Bill, it was true, powers were given to combine, but surely it was far better to have one large authority than a large number of small areas combined for one reason, and not combined regarding others in connection with the purposes of education. That would be most inconvenient. It was perfectly simple when there was only one parish school for the local school board to manage it, but at the present time a great deal more was done than in the ordinary parish school. They had to deal with questions relating to secondary and technical education, the appointment of teachers, and medical inspection. If the boards were to carry out that work properly under the present Bill, it would be far more satisfactory to have a large authority to do so. In England the county council had been constituted the local education authority and the system was working with complete satisfaction in every part of the country. They had been told that Sutherland was a large county, but the same might be said of Northumberland and Devonshire. In each of these counties the county council was the local education authority, and no difficulty had been met with in the administration. If they were to have really good officials and really efficient administration, it would be better to have the large authority. The larger the boards the more likely were they to get first-class men to serve upon them, and the better would be the administration for all concerned.

*Mr. LAMONT (Buteshire) supported the new clause moved by his hon. friend. He must admit that in listening to the speech of the seconder the character in the Old Testament that came to his mind was not Esau, Jacob, or Methuselah, but Jeremiah. He supported the new clause because he believed that the enlargement of the area was by far the most important reform which could be undertaken in the whole field of Scottish education. In the first place, the larger area would strengthen the local authority as against the central authority. In the next place, he believed the district area was the best for education as it had been proved to be the best for local government. By establishing the larger area for administrative purposes they would create an authority able to deal not only with elementary but with secondary education also, and thereby there would be a system of co-ordination which would simplify both. The position of good teachers would be improved because the board having authority over a larger area would be able when vacancies occurred to promote their best teachers to the best appointments in the area within their control. Furthermore, it would facilitate the dealing with the unsatisfactory or inefficient teachers. In a small parish area it was sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to find men who had a knowledge of educational work, or who had any education themselves. It was very difficult in that case to have the unsatisfactory teacher promptly dealt with, because in a small community the members of the school board might be his most intimate friends. By extending the area and having a larger board they got over that difficulty. He voted for a similar Amendment when the late Government was in office. At that time he was hon. secretary of the Scottish Educational Reform Association, of which the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State for War was then the head. Holding the same opinions now as then, he would support the Amendment.

*Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he found himself in considerable difficulty about the Amendment. He sympathised with its object, but he could not say that he assented to the particular form in which it was proposed that it should be achieved. He thought the parish area had ceased to be the ideal area for present-day conditions. After all, many years had passed since the Education Act of 1872 was passed, setting up the parish area as the unit of administration. He could not speak of the county because he knew little or nothing about it, but he could quite conceive there was a good deal in what had been said by his hon. friend the Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities as to the desirability of coupling-up some of these microscopic bodies and making them more widely representative. He was more concerned with the towns, and he professed to know something of the conditions there. He knew that the parish areas there were not the most suitable for education administration. As a matter of fact, the population of Scotland was now differently distributed from what it was thirty-six years ago, and this population difficulty must cause a very considerable amount of confusion in regard to the administration of school board affairs. On the Second Reading debate he mentioned some figures which he might repeat now. Govan, although in the main an industrial centre, embraced in its school board area many people who were fairly well-to-do. Govan, therefore, had an advantage because there were many children in the area who did not go to the public schools, although the parents paid the school rate. It was found that in Govan the school rate of 1s. 4d. in the £ produced £3 9s. 3½d. per head, while in Glasgow the rate of 1s. 5d. only produced £2 15s. or £2 16s. That was manifestly unfair, and that was one of the considerations which weighed with him in thinking that there should be rearrangement of school board areas. He failed to appreciate the emphasis which the Lord Advocate laid on the parish area as the traditional area. He himself was not there to support anything because it was traditional. He wished to adapt the school board areas as well as other things to modern requirements. When he found the areas were not suitable for these requirements, he must say that he wanted to see them altered. So far, it might appear that he was going to support the Amendment, but he was not going to do anything of the sort. He was going to vote against it. However much he might wish to see the area altered, he recognised that the method by which it was proposed to be done was not the best. Clause 20 of the Bill provided for dealing with cases where only one authority was necessary, and if Glasgow felt strongly that its position was inequitable in relation to Govan, it could take action under that clause. The same clause provided for the coupling-up of small areas for continuation and secondary school purposes, and that, of course, was a complete answer to the hon. Member for the Universities. It provided for the initiative coming from those on the spot who knew the local requirements better than people either in London or Edinburgh. He thought that, on the whole, the Bill went as far as they could reasonably demand at the present time.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said he was at one with the last speaker in preferring the authority of a large area rather than the one suggested in the proposed Amendment. But he was prepared to vote for that Amendment because he felt so strongly the desirability of impressing on the Department the dissatisfaction which existed in the towns at the bureaucratic system under which they in Scotland had to suffer. He would prefer to vote for the new clause because it would have the effect of lessening the number of school boards, whereas the policy of the Department had been to increase the number of school boards so as to stultify them and thereby increase their hold over them. He thought this clause would have the effect of largely simplifying the Scottish educational system, which had been rendered complex by the Department in order to keep the reins in their own hands. He differed from the Secretary for Scotland with reference to the control of the Scottish Members over the Education Department. They had none, and to say so was an illusion and a delusion. On the Second Reading of the Bill the Scottish Secretary said that Parliament controlled the Education Department; but the present Secretary for War, when he sat on the other side of the House, said that he viewed with great anxiety the increasing power which that Department had obtained. And the present Chief Secretary for Ireland once said with regard to the influence of the Scottish Members that—

> "Home Rule or no Home Rule, one thing was practically certain, and that was that Scotland would never get Scottish business done

as things were at present. Her Members might as well be sent to Pekin as to Westminster."

It should be remembered that it was their duty in that House to represent the people of Scotland and not to allow the Education Department, however zealous its officials might be, and whatever good they had done in the past, to dominate the Scottish educational system and to rule the Scottish Education Department. This Bill was the direct outcome not so much of the wishes of the Scottish representatives or of the Scottish people as of the permanent officials of the Scottish Education Department; and anything they could do to lessen the strength of the Department and curb it the better it would be in the interests of Scottish education. That was why he would support the Amendment.

*MR. R. DUNCAN said that the hon. Member for the Blackfriars division of Glasgow naturally took an opposite view from what he did with regard to Govan. The Govan parish extended far beyond the municipality of Glasgow, and the Govan school board dealt with, a large population and a wide area though perhaps not so large as that of Glasgow. One of the paragraphs in the Amendment gave power to separate part of one school board district from another, and that he objected to as far as it affected Govan School Board area. He did not know whether the figures given by the hon. Member for the Blackfriars division were correct or not, but it was quite possible that the higher figure for Govan was because of the greater efficiency of the Govan schools, which were admitted to be very efficient. He objected most strongly to have the Govan school board amalgamated with that of Glasgow. He had an Amendment later on to that effect.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was out of order in speaking to that Amendment now.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said that it would possibly save time if he admitted that the point raised by the hon. Member was not really a very essential one. A possible exception might be made in favour of Govan.

*MR. R. DUNCAN said he only wished to emphasise the fact that he thought Govan parish was a proper school board district, and that if the average cost of the education of the children was higher per head than in Glasgow, it was on account of the higher efficiency.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said he had been very much interested in the views put forward by the hon. Member for Blackfriars division. So far as he could gather, while the hon. Member agreed entirely, or to a large extent, that in many parts of the country a large area would not only be a benefit, but almost a necessity, he objected to the particular method of arriving at that result adopted in the Amendment. He quite agreed with the hon. Member, and candidly confessed that he did not think the new clause was the most desirable way in which the desired result could be achieved. He thought it would have been better, more courageous perhaps, if they had boldly embodied a proposal to put the larger areas into the Bill; but he asked what chance there would have been for this, or any other Government, to carry such a new clause at the present time. The Amendment, after all, was only an enabling clause. This question of larger areas had been discussed before more than once; and he would recall to the House the views which had been enunciated from hon. Members on the Treasury bench on the former occasion. The Lord Advocate said he thought that the Amendment was bureaucracy run mad; and he stuck up for the old traditional parish area. The right hon. Gentleman had done that previously with great success and conspicuous ability, but he would remind him that his views were not shared then by some of his present colleagues. The Secretary of State for War, speaking on the Education Bill of 1904, said, in regard to the question of areas, that the present difficulty arose from the fact that the existing areas were not selected for educational purposes, and that he knew of no way of getting out of the difficulty except by allowing powers of combination of a more specific kind than that given in the Bill. Mr. Bryce, now our Ambassador to America, put the whole case in a nutshell when he said that the county was too large an area for elementary education, and that the better plan would be to take the parish as a primary unit, and to unite with a free hand the smaller areas and so create areas of the size of the present districts. And then Mr. Bryce went on to say that the proper authority might be one small county, or if necessary two small counties. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty also rushed into the debate on the question of areas. He said that he admitted the good work done by the school boards, and the necessity of keeping the people in touch with the schools. Then the hon. Gentleman went on to criticise the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark in favour of the retention of the existing areas in the Bill of 1904, and said in regard to that proposal that the scheme of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark was educational Home Rule run mad.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 29 ; Noes, 158. (Division List No. 367.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pirie, Duncan V.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Munro Ferguson and Sir Henry Craik.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bryce, J. Annan
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W.E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport

Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. SINCLAIR moved to insert in Clause 3, after the word "institutions," the words "within or." He said that, by the clause, they enabled the school board to contribute towards the maintenance of crippled or defective children at homes outwith the district of the board, but they did not give them power within their district. Therefore he proposed this Amendment, which was an obvious one.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, after the word 'institutions,' to insert the words 'within or.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

*MR. COCHRANE said he had also raised this question, and with all due respect to the Education Department of which the right hon. Gentleman was the head, he submitted that his grammar was better than that of the right hon. Gentleman. He proposed to leave out the word "outwith" in the Bill, and insert the words "whether within or without." In Scotland they were acquainted with the word "outwith," but in an Act of Parliament, which would have to be construed by English as well as Scottish lawyers, he thought it would be well to put in words which would be generally understood by the ordinary person. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman, although he was head of the Scottish Education Department, would withdraw his Amendment and allow his to be moved.

MR. SINCLAIR said he would propose the words.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham) suggested that the Amendment should be put in the form to leave out the word "outwith," and insert the words "within or without."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SINCLAIR moved an Amendment in the form suggested by Mr. Deputy-Speaker.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 12, to leave out the word 'outwith,' and insert the words "within or without.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. SINCLAIR moved, in Clause 4, to leave out from the word "supplied" to the end of the clause. The words, he explained, were not necessary as there was no other person employed or supplied for "the like purpose" under any other provision of this Act.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, to leave out from the word 'supplied' to the end of the clause."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. COCHRANE said the Amendment he now moved sought to clear up a little ambiguity in the Bill. Clause 5 enacted that relief of a permanent character might be given to children where their parents were unable by reason of poverty or ill-health to supply food or clothing or to give the child necessary personal attention during the period in which it was under the obligation to attend school. The proviso at the end was that the school board should, in cases where they thought necessary, make temporary provision out of the fund, but there was no power as in the previous section to exempt genuine cases where through temporary causes, such as ill-health, a parent was *bona-fide* unable to provide for the child. The concluding words of the section, that the cost might be recovered as an alimentary debt, would carry imprisonment; obviously this would be very harsh treatment in view of the different treatment provided for permanent cases in the earlier part of the same section.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 9, after the word 'debt,' to insert the words 'unless it is found that such parent or guardian was unable by reason of poverty or ill-health to supply sufficient and proper food or clothing for the child, or to give the child the necessary personal attention.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR accepted the Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY objected to the Amendment being accepted without some reason being given by the Government. He was not at all sure that he approved of an Amendment which made it easy for everybody to obtain maintenance for their children at the expense of the State. Clause 5 as it stood was, in his opinion, quite sufficient for all purposes, and this Amendment went far beyond the necessities of the case. If a man was a pauper it was no use trying to make out that he was not, and he did not believe a pauper was a fit and proper person to exercise the franchise. Everything necessary was provided for in the section, and it was no use going further and saying that if the parents could not pay the amount should not be recoverable. That went without saying. If the Amendment was accepted the only result would be that nothing would be done. If it was not accepted the same result would follow. No school board would bring an action against a person without money. But there was this fact that might come in, that a man might get money in the future, and the school board might then recover. He was inclined to think they ought not to vote for the Amendment. But, at all events, they ought to have some reason from the Government for accepting it, because if it was necessary the Government Bill was defective, and he was sure hon. Gentlemen opposite would not agree to that.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said it was in no hostile spirit that he now rose. He thought the Amendment of his hon. friend was a mistake. He thought the words "that aid given in the terms of the section should not deprive parents of any franchise, right, or privilege, or subject him to any disability" would be an evil to the working people of the country, and that it was a pity that they should remain there. But that was not the point he now raised. The question just now was with regard to this particular Amendment, the effect of which would be to introduce difficulties. The scheme of the clause was perfectly clear. If the parent could not pay for his child this clause made provision for it. But another case might come up where it was necessary to give immediate relief to a starving child. If the parent could afford to pay the school board should be paid, otherwise the expense would fall on the parochial rate. If this Amendment were accepted it would cause considerable doubt in the mind of the school boards and cause them to hesitate very much before they fed a child whom they found starved. He was quite certain the scheme of the clause was sufficient as it stood.

*MR. COCHRANE explained that in Grand Committee the rule was laid down that relief might be given permanently during the period at which the child was at school in cases where the parent was unable to provide for it. Towards the end of Clause 5 it was also provided that a child might be temporarily relieved, but there it was not provided that where the parent of the child might be unable to give the child the necessary food, the cost should not be recoverable. They made no provision to protect the parents in the case of temporary relief as was the case with regard to permanent relief, and the result might be that if a man who could not pay was proceeded against and did not pay because he could not he could be sent to prison. The power contained in the concluding words of the section to recover the cost as an alimentary debt carried with it the penalty of imprisonment, almost the only remaining relic of the power to imprison for debt.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.) thought they ought to have a pronouncement from the Government as to their reasons for accepting the Amendment. If the Amendment was to carry out the mover's desire, he ought to have been more careful in his phraseology. Who was to find that "such a parent or guardian was unable by reason of poverty or ill-health to supply sufficient and proper food or clothing" to his child? It would be much better to put in some words to make it clear who was to determine whether or not the parent or guardian was unable by reason of poverty or ill-health, and he suggested that the school board should be the determining authority. He thought it only courteous to the House that they should have some pronouncement from the Government in the matter, and that they should be informed what was the attitude of the Government, and whether they thought the phraseology of the Amendment carried out the meaning of the mover.

Mr. SINCLAIR said the position of the Government might be summed up in a sentence. The Amendment would serve as an indication to the school boards who were making this temporary provision for a child, whilst in no way impairing the power which they possessed under the clause. He thought, therefore, it was a proper enough addition to the Bill, and the Government proposed to accept it. He agreed that it would be better to follow the wording in the earlier part of the clause, and, instead of "unless it is found," to use the words "unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the school board."

Mr. Cochrane.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) asked why the words "or ill-health" should be inserted. The whole question was whether the parent or guardian could afford to pay or not, and it seemed quite unnecessary to have these words in. If a parent was in ill-health on account of poverty or in poverty on account of ill-health, the case would be covered by the words "by reason of poverty," alone. It seemed to him therefore that it would be better drafting to leave out the words "or ill-health."

Mr. SINCLAIR suggested that the wording in the earlier part of the clause should be followed. If it was fitting there, he thought it should be allowed to stand here.

Mr. BARNES said it occurred to him that the Amendment implied that some action should be taken by the school board, and that, failing that action, no debt would be recoverable, whereas he understood from the Secretary for Scotland that he proposed that the debt should be recoverable unless it was shown to the satisfaction of the school board that the parent or guardian was unable, by reason of poverty or ill-health, to supply sufficient and proper food or clothing for the child. Did not that imply that the parent was to be put in a worse position than otherwise?

Mr. SINCLAIR said it did not in the least imply that. It was a direction to the school board that, when they were considering whether the debt should be recovered or not, they should have regard to the poverty or ill-health of the parent as a sufficient reason for not recovering.

Mr. COCHRANE thought, if the words of his Amendment were to be corrected at all, it would be better to take the whole words in the earlier part of the clause.

Mr. SINCLAIR disagreed and pointed out that the earlier part of the clause referred to permanent provision, whereas the Amendment referred solely to immediate and temporary provision. It was not unless the school board was satisfied that there was a case to prosecute that any prosecution would take place.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

> "In line 1, to leave out the word 'found,' in order to insert the words 'shown to the satisfaction of the school board.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment to proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

MR. JAMES HOPE moved to insert the words "or guardian" in Clause 6, after the word "parent." He presumed the word "parent" was meant to include "guardian," but it did not say so as in other clauses, and he submitted that, if they did not insert the words, it would distinctly exclude a guardian.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 10, after the word 'parent,' to insert the words 'or guardian.'"—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said he gave an undertaking in Committee that the Bill should be looked through and the words "or guardian" inserted where necessary. That applied specially to Clauses 8 and 9, though his undertaking was not limited to that. There were Amendments down to insert the words in those clauses, but this clause was really a re-enactment of former enactments, and the word "parent" covered what the hon. Gentleman wished, and there was no reason to put in the words "or guardian."

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) differed from the right hon. Gentleman as to the necessity of the words "or guardian" in the clause. The words had apparently been put in the Bill at the sweet will of the draftsman, and, unless they were inserted in this clause, the unfortunate child who had lost its parent would not necessarily be educated. It was essential that the guardian of a child whose parents had died should be instructed to give it education, otherwise there would be a number of children in Scotland who would not necessarily be educated under the Bill. The insertion of the words "or guardian" was essential.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON thought the Amendment was unnecessary. The Bill would have to be read with the Education Acts. The sixth section of the principal Act of 1872 contained this definition—

> "Parent shall include guardian and any person who is liable to maintain or has the actual custody of any child."

He did not think the insertion of the words "or guardian" all through the Bill had been necessary except on the principle (an important one he admitted) that they had been inserted in some places and were excluded in this place.

Amendment negatived.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON moved to insert the word "elementary," so that Clause 6 should read: "It shall be the duty of every parent to provide efficient 'elementary' education for his children who are between five and fourteen years of age," The question was discussed in Committee, and he was bringing it up in fulfilment of a promise given in Committee that on Report they would have an opportunity for further consideration of these words. There was some embarrassment and confusion as to the precise attitude of the Government and some of their supporters with regard to this Amendment. At one moment the right hon. Gentleman showed a disposition to accept some Amendment of this character, and at another he asked them to defer consideration until Report. They were sure to have many objections urged against it by the Government, but there was one objection which he hoped no hon. Member would urge. He hoped it would not be said that this was an Amendment intended to limit and cramp the cause of education. There was nothing easier than to make a speech of that kind. Those who had not considered the subject would at once think there was a great deal of force in that contention. The plain facts were that this word "elementary," and even much stronger and more stringent defining words had been in every Education Act which had ever been passed for Scotland from 1872 down to 1901. So anxious was he to provide against any possible assertion of crippling that he had actually omitted the words which appeared in previous Acts, "in reading, writing and arithmetic." It was with a view of adopting the course which the Secretary for Scotland suggested, the insertion in the definition clause of a definition of what was meant by the word "elementary." The right hon. Gentleman had suggested a definition in Committee. He had not embodied it in the Amendment because he thought the right hon. Gentleman would probably prefer that the definition should be considered by those who advised the Department. There should be some definition of what was meant by "efficient education." They were laying a duty upon every parent. It was the first Act in which the precise limit and scope of that duty had not been defined. Not only did they lay the duty, but they imposed penalties. He seemed to recollect that the duty used to be defined as a "contingent liability to a sanction." The penalty which was attached to this duty was 20s. or fourteen days for the parent, with a repetition of the penalty according to the repetition of the offence. If they were really going to say, and he took it that the clause could have no other meaning, that it was to be the duty of every parent in Scotland, high or low, rich or poor, gentle or simple, that he might be called upon to provide secondary education for his children, it was a very serious proposition indeed. It was one that no country had ever faced yet, and he very much doubted whether even Scotland, advanced as she was in educational matters, could face it. He remembered the hon. Member for Mid Lanark pointing out in the debates in 1904 that, although secondary education was technically not compulsory under the existing Acts, in practice there were many parish schools where the pupils at the top were given secondary education with very good results. That was a very different thing from saying it was to be the duty of every parent to provide such an education. He pressed the Government and their advisers to take very seriously into consideration whether or not they should not, when they imposed a duty upon a parent, also define in accurate, clear and definite language, about which there could be no mistake, the precise scope of the duty which was laid upon them.

CAPTAIN CRAIG seconded.

Amendment proposed.—

"In page 4, line 11, after the word 'efficient,' to insert the word 'elementary.'"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'elementary' be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said that this question was very fully discussed in Committee upstairs, and the decision was, by a very large majority, in favour of the view expressed on behalf of the Government.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: The right hon. Gentleman began by offering to accept the Amendment.

MR. SINCLAIR said a good many things had happened in the course of the discussion. He was taking what happened at the end of the discussion which lasted for more than one day. One of the broad grounds for not accepting the Amendment was that the conditions under which parents were obliged to send their children to school between the ages of five and fourteen, were laid down for the last time under the Act of 1901, which gave the school boards power to grant certain exemptions after the age of twelve years, on certain conditions which the school board laid down—conditions which generally made up to the child for the loss of educational opportunities which his exemption from the age of twelve onwards might cause. In carrying out this statute the school boards had considered that that exemption had never been based on the question of attainment, and in so acting they had been acting entirely in accordance with the spirit of educational administration in Scotland, which had never been to limit or deny to any child, however humble, the full opportunity afforded by public education. His first objection to the Amendment was that a standard of attainment was suggested as a guiding principle for the exemption of children from attendance at school. There could be nothing more injurious either to the children or to education than the operation of such a standard. Secondly, practical difficulties had been found in the carrying out of educational administration, because parents had thought that it was in their discretion to pick and choose and select for themselves the subjects in which their children were to be educated. It was essential in the interests of the children that the organisation and planning of educational time-tables should rest in the hands of the educational authority, and that the parents should conform to the arrangements that suited the majority of the pupils. This was not an imaginary difficulty, for it had occurred, and the Courts had decided against the parent. This was, and must be, a limiting Amendment. Although, very happily, the standard of attainment was rising in Scotland every year, and education was compulsory and free, it would be out of place to accept any limiting suggestion of this kind. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with having raised the question. He admitted its importance, but the reasons for the attitude of the Government were so cogent that he could not advise the House to take any other course than to reject the Amendment.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said he intruded in no unfriendly spirit to the Bill, which he heartily welcomed as a Scotsman. He was glad to see Scotland getting measures so much in advance of what they had been able to get for other parts of the country. But he felt that there was merit in the Amendment. It entirely resolved itself into a question of what was efficient education. Under this clause a parent was compelled to send his child of five years of age to school, there to obtain efficient education. While he admitted that some children were capable of receiving efficient education at five years of age, they had to admit that the average child did not receive at a public school efficient education until the age of eight or nine. Therefore, it might be possible to introduce words here to provide that elementary education should only be insisted upon up to the age of nine or ten, and for the remaining compulsory period of attendance efficient education would then be insisted upon. There was no real difference between the views of the mover of the Amendment and the Government, and he thought a mutual concession should be made on the lines he had indicated. It could not be the wish of the Government in this measure—which he hoped would stand for many years as a model of what good education could be provided—to compel the parent to provide what was called in the statute "efficient education" for a child of five years of age.

SIR F. BANBURY said the object of the Amendment was to define what education should be given to the child by the parent. Unless the words proposed were inserted the only persons who would be able to decide that efficient education was being given to a child would be the members of the school board. Undoubtedly under the Bill the people who would decide this question in the future would be the members of the school board. If they left in the words "efficient education" there would be nothing to prevent the school board from saying that no education except that given by themselves was efficient. If the word "elementary," was put in that would be a defining word, and it could be argued that the parent was giving efficient education, whereas if the word was left out the school board could say: "We do not consider the education you are giving is efficient, and the only efficient education is that which we are giving." The result might be that one school board would lay down a rule that all the children must come in, because the education would not otherwise be efficient, and another school board might declare that the ordinary education given by the parent should be considered efficient. In the interests of the Bill itself, it was advisable that the same standard should prevail in the case of every school board, and it should not be left to the arbitrary decision of any school board to determine what was efficient education. If the word "elementary" was put in every school board would be obliged to exempt a child whose parent was giving it efficient elementary education. It was evident if they had a very advanced school presided over, for example, by the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, he would be desirous that every child in his area should attend that particular school, and he was not so sure that that would be a wise thing. If a parent was willing to give efficient education to his child, it would be better that it should be given at home than under the school board. He was inclined to think that the first thoughts of the right hon. Gentleman in which he was in favour of accepting this Amendment, were the best. Apparently the right hon. Gentleman had been guided by the fact that he could not carry his Amendment against the wishes of his own friends.

MR. JAMES HOPE wished to put a practical case. Supposing they took, for example, the case of a widowed lady with an only daughter. Supposing that lady gave her daughter the best education in her power, and taught her such subjects as French, housekeeping, etc. Would the local school board be able to say to that lady: "We do not approve of the type of education you are giving to your daughter; it is not elementary, and it is a bad form of secondary education; we are the judges, and we think your education is not efficient; you must send your daughter to the village school." Would that lady have to send her daughter to school without any appeal whatever?

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 172. (Division List No. 368.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Sutherland, J. E.
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Mitchell-Thomson and Sir Frederick Banbury.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bryce, J. Annan
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter

Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey,W. E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
M‘Cullum, John M.
M‘Crae, Sir George
M‘Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks,G. (Croydon,Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norton, Captain Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Yoxall, Henry James

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Clause 7:

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry), in moving to leave out Clause 7, said the clause appeared to be intended to introduce an entirely new principle in the regulations for compelling school attendance. It was intended to supersede the ninth section of the Act of 1883, which provided that after due warning a school board could apply to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to issue an order to compel the attendance of a child at school. So far as he could understand the clause, the penalties under Section 9 of the 1883 Act were still to exist with regard to the infringement of the order which would now be made by the school board. The school board were interested parties, and he asked the House to consider whether it was right that at a secret meeting at which reporters would not be present the board should be allowed to adjudicate. A school board was interested in getting the greatest possible number of attendances in order to get the greatest possible grant. That could not be said to be an entirely impartial tribunal before which to arraign a parent. The only chance which the parent had was to appeal to the sheriff if he felt aggrieved by the order of the school board. That imposed on the parent the duty of attending twice—first before the school board, and then before the sheriff. To many parents that would be an extremely difficult and inconvenient thing to do. He could not see any sufficient reason for altering the old procedure. He begged to move.

SIR HENRY CRAIK, in seconding the Motion, said the new procedure proposed by the Government would make the school board prosecutor and judge in its own cause. Hitherto there had been two distinct offences possible under the

Education Act. The first was the neglect of the parent to educate his child under Section 70 of the Act of 1872. Then Section 9 of the Act of 1883 provided that when the neglect had existed for a certain time the school board might bring the parent before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, and the Court might lay upon the parent a totally different duty—not merely that of providing education, but of making the child attend school. Did the right hon. Gentleman clearly understand that except an attendance order had been obtained no previous Education Act required any parent to send his child to school at all? It required him to educate his child, but it did not require him to send it to school. What was proposed by Clause 7 of the Bill was that Section 9 of the 1883 Act should no longer have effect in its present sense. They made it simply an alternative, and an alternative to be taken at the first stage. The duty laid on the parent in the first instance by the Act of 1872 was to educate the child, and it was only if he neglected to do so that an order could be applied for to compel attendance at school. A parent might say: "I do not want school board education for my child." There were many educated people who said they were capable of judging what was good for their children in the matter of education. He had known cases where parents had complained that they were being bothered by school boards to send their children to school, and where the boards were surprised to be told that there was no obligation whatever to send children to school. The Government were mixing up two things, and they were establishing in place of a Court of law a sort of Star Chamber, of a school board, which need not necessarily be open to the public, and they were to be the accuser and the judge. There seemed to be an inherent desire in the occupants of the Treasury bench to supersede the Courts of law. He wanted to know why the Government thought it necessary to take away the ordinary privilege of going to the Courts of law.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out Clause 7."—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'of,' in page 4, line 39, stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR said he really did not think that the change intended by the clause was of such magnitude as had been represented. The clause was introduced at the unanimous request of the school boards of Scotland.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: What about the parents?

MR. SINCLAIR said the school boards of Scotland had found great difficulty in securing the attendance of children, and the Government had to consider whether or not this simplified procedure could be introduced without any infringement of the position of the parents or of the children themselves. Under the old procedure in order to obtain an attendance order the school board went before the sheriff, and, having got it, they in their discretion applied it to the parent. Then the parent went to the sheriff, and he decided the case. The procedure now proposed was merely a simplification of that. The school board, which presumably knew the circumstances, issued the attendance order, and then when the order was put into execution the parent was taken before the sheriff. No harm came to the parent, and no penalty was inflicted except by the sheriff himself. The parent would be in no worse position than under the previous procedure, but a great deal of superfluous work would be saved in the Sheriff Court, while the school board had a more expeditious way of carrying out its work, and the organisation of the schools would profit *pro tanto* by the whole procedure.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that all this was practically a litigation between the parents and the school board as the school attendance authority. He quite understood that one party to a litigation should desire to be made a judge in its own cause, at any rate on the early stage of it. The school attendance authority complained that a child, without just cause, had been kept away from school, and it wished to decide that matter without the intervention of a Court of justice at an early stage. What was the ordinary practice at the present time in England and Scotland? The school attendance authority complained that the child was kept away from school. The matter was taken before the Court of Summary Jurisdiction in England, and before the sheriff in Scotland, and the question was that if the child would not attend for the next fortnight or so an attendance order would be made, and the parent was warned. Very frequently no further proceedings were required; but if so, the Court would mete out justice in accordance with the merits of the case. But what was the beautiful simplicity of the proposal in this clause? It was that the school attendance authority complained to itself that the parent had been neglecting to send its child to school; and then decided its own cause in its own favour. Contrary to the existing practice, there was no question of warning to the parents, or of postponing the action of the Court in order to see whether a better behaviour would be secured on the part of the child or the parents. Then the attendance order was made, and the matter came before the sheriff, who probably knew nothing of the facts, but who would be called upon to act in the best possible faith, but with undue severity. This was a matter in which the liberty of the subject was concerned, for when a parent was compelled to send a child to school his liberty was interfered with, a right which ought to be exercised with the greatest care and only after looking to the interest of all concerned. For a school board which looked to attendance as a means for securing grants to judge its own cause was an infringement of the liberty of the subject which the House should not agree to without the most careful consideration.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that all this talk with regard to the liberty of the subject was entirely out of place. If the hon. Gentleman would peruse the clause, he would see that two conditions must be applied. In the first place, the thing was to be done by the parent without reasonable excuse; and in the second place, after due warning to the parents. Then it was that the school board had to get an attendance order. The final stage was that, if the parent thought that the school board was wrong, he could appeal to the sheriff, and the proceedings before the sheriff were exceedingly simple and short. The House was not considering at present whether the school board was a judge in its own cause. What they wanted was the fact that where the child was neglected and kept away from school, that should be brought home to the parents.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON could not see how the parent could be given more careful consideration than under this clause, and he really failed to see how a school board was able to deal with truancy without interfering between parent and child. The board could interview the parent and the child, and if the parent was at fault he was not as a rule an object for much consideration. The ordinary parent was a good parent, and his children generally went readily to school. His experience was that the defaulting parents were the most ill-conditioned and drunken part of the population. He had known of twenty-one cases of truancy coming from one street inhabited by such people. He thought that the interview between the school board and the parent was simply invaluable for the purpose of preventing truancy.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) said that the Lord Advocate seemed to argue that they ought not to consider the liberty of the subject, and that the provisions of the clause were no infringement on the rights of parents. But the clause gave to the school board an unlimited power over the parents. The fact that the school board was to act as prosecutor, jury, and judge in each case was sufficient to condemn the clause. What was the procedure under the clause? If it appeared to a school board that the parent of any child was, without reasonable excuse, neglecting to provide for its efficient education, or failing to secure the regular attendance of the child at some public or inspected school, the parent was summoned before the school board and required to give every information and explanation respecting such neglect or failure of duty. The neglect or failure of duty was taken for for granted. The school board had only to exercise a little imagination, and then summon the parent before them. Then the clause went on to say that if the parent, or some person on his behalf, either did not appear, or appeared and did not satisfy the school board that he had not failed in his duty without reasonable excuse, then an attendance order was issued. There again the school board was prosecutor, jury, and judge. Further, the parent had to prove that he had not failed in his duty. Surely it was a prosecutor who had to prove the fault, and not the defendant to show that he had not committed the fault. He was on the Grand Committee, and he knew that many of the clauses had been passed without due consideration to the rights of the parents.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that as an English Member, and as a parent who sent his children to an elementary school, he and those beside him probably knew more about this matter than hon. Gentlemen above the gangway, none of whom had, in all likelihood, had their children at an elementary school. He thought that the clause was quite clear and simple. The parent must show that he was educating his children by some other method than in the elementary school. The school board was a popularly elected body, subject to the parents of whose children they had the oversight, and the members of the board were not likely to do an unreasonable thing when they knew that the parents could get rid of them at election times. Again, due warning was given to the parents. Every opportunity was given them to supply information and make explanation. The hon. Gentleman above the gangway wanted to drag the mother before a magistrate in the first instance. He protested against that. They in England did not want it, and would not have it. In England the officials of the school board reported to the attendance committee that a child was not attending school, and the parent and the child were brought before the school board committee, who talked to the mother, it might be, very nicely and persuaded her to have more oversight over the child. They did not drag her before a Court until all its influence was used in the direction of persuasion. He hoped the Government would not for one moment give way on this point. The system was working satisfactorily with them in England. [AN HON. MEMBER on the OPPOSITION Benches: No.] Somebody said no, but he knew what he was talking about. They never took a mother or father of a child to a Court in the first instance, or before they had had more than one opportunity of interviewing both the parent and the child. It was the very last resource to take the parent before a Court of law. They used their power of persuasion, and the attendance order was really a following up of the interview with the parents, and so far as these were concerned it was no more than a threat that unless they saw that their children went to school other proceedings would be taken. That was the best method of dealing with refractory parents. It was the child that they wanted to get at, and frequently the keeping away from school was the fault of the child itself and its companions. He trusted the House would never accept an Amendment which would bring the child into Court until that became absolutely necessary.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down did not seem to understand the question before the House. The hon. Member had entered a very proper defence of the system in England, and so far he was prepared to accept his view. But this Amendment altered the state of affairs existing in Scotland and would make it different from that which prevailed in England, which the hon. Gentleman had rightly praised. Yet the hon. Member said he was prepared to accept the clause, although it would alter in Scotland the state of things now prevailing there and in England. He would ask, however, whether it was desirable that they should be so anxious to alter the tribunals, which had dealt between man and man in this country so fairly, and bring in other tribunals. It had been contended that the parents in default needed no special consideration, but that was not a judicial point of view. He was sure it was not the state of mind in which magistrates dealt with matters of this kind. They had sooner or later to come to the magistrate, and it was desirable, if they did bring attendance cases of this sort before the bench, that consideration, and most careful consideration, should be given, even to defaulting parents. They should be dealt with from the judicial point of view, and the consideration should be given in a judicial frame of mind, even to people who were apparently in default. He believed, and he was certain hon. Members below the gangway also thought, that that was the way in which to deal with defaulting parents, who ought to have every consideration from a judicial tribunal, before they had an attendance order made against them. Perhaps he ought to apologise for intervening in this debate, as it did not concern him, but he wanted to protest simply from the judicial side against expressions which had been thrown out and to state the objection he had to dealing with judicial matters in this way. This might be a good alteration from some aspects, but in his view it was a bad one, and he should vote against the clause. Other hon. Members might hold different views, but he hoped they would not hold the view that this was an unimportant alteration of the law as it had existed in Scotland and England for many years.

SIR F. BANBURY said there was considerable discussion on this clause in Grand Committee and he would like, for the benefit of those hon. Members who had not the advantage of being there, to state what took place. The Lord Advocate stated that there was the safeguard of an appeal, but it was pointed out that that would be illusory, for the reason that, especially in the Highland districts of Scotland, the probability was that the parents summoned would be poor people. They would be summoned before the school board and would know very little about the further safeguard of an appeal, and if they did know it, they would have to go many, many miles to the sheriff. When summoned before the school board, a poor person would have to lose a day's work, and if the decision was unjust his only resource was to lose another day's work, possibly two or three, in order to go to the Sheriff's Court. He was rather surprised that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, who were always most anxious not to put pecuniary liabilities upon the poorer classes of the country, should support this clause. He really thought it must be because they were not on the Grand Committee, and did not fully realise its importance. The Lord Advocate dismissed very summarily the statement of his hon. friend that this particular clause would make a school board prosecutor and judge in its own cause by saying that it was necessary and advisable that the children should attend school and therefore it was right that the school board should be both judge and prosecutor. It was right that stealing should be prevented, but they did not enact that the prosecutor in a case of theft should be the judge in his own cause because it was right to stop thieving. He really thought the Government ought to pause before they made a startling innovation in the law of Great Britain of this kind. He appealed to hon. Members below the gangway to realise that they were inflicting a very great pecuniary liability upon the poor parent who considered himself aggrieved by the arbitrary decision of a school board. The object of the school board was to get as many attendances as possible in order to get a grant, and great hardship to poor people would result if the clause were allowed to pass in its present form. He believed that the existing procedure was working fairly, and he would point out to the hon. Member for Clitheroe that if this clause was not passed there was nothing to prevent the school boards in Scotland sending for parents and pointing out in a fatherly manner that unless they sent their children to school they were injuring them and if they persisted proceedings would be taken. If this clause was passed, instead of persuasive power being used by the school board, they would insist upon the child coming to school, and when the parent had found out the remedy he would be put to great expense in taking advantage of that remedy.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 158; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 369.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Balfour, Robert (Lanark
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A C. (Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Forster, Henry William
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Bridgeman and Sir Frederick Banbury.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON moved to leave out the words "or some person on his behalf." He did not think the appearance of a deputy of the parent before the school board would add to the good working of the clause. The interview by the school board with the parent was a good opportunity for the board to influence the parent, but if it was to be allowed to send a deputy, who probably in many centres would be a professional representative, then the value of the clause would be very largely lost. He had had a great many representations on this point since the Bill went through Committee, and great importance was attached to it by the administrators of the school board system. He was sure no school board would unnecessarily summon a parent before it, and that every consideration would be shown. There was no fear of any hardship, and it would add enormously to the value of school board work. He really thought the school boards were entitled to some consideration under the Bill.

*Mr. COCHRANE seconded. He said he understood it was intended that the parent should be brought before the Board in a private way and an endeavour made to induce him to send his child to school. They did not want a lawyer or anyone to appear before the board to argue the matter. Were they to have the village orator appearing before the board every time, and arguing why children should not be compelled to attend? In the Children Bill they insisted that the parent should be the only person who should appear before the Court, and he ventured to say that the right hon. Gentleman, in inserting the words "or some other person on his behalf," had departed from the principle laid down that the attendance before the board should be private and informal. The words were put in in Grand Committee during the luncheon hour, being accepted by the Secretary of Scotland without there being any opportunity of discussing them, and with no weighty reasons having been given for them.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, to leave out the words 'or some person on his behalf.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. SINCLAIR said the reason the words were put in was plain and simple. There was a considerable discussion as to whether they had provided in the clause for all contingencies, and the words, "If he, or some person on his behalf, either does not appear or appears and does not satisfy the school board" seemed to meet the only contingencies which might emerge out of the summons. It was represented in the Committee that it might be a great and unmerited hardship to a parent to be obliged to appear. He might have an excellent excuse which would completely satisfy the school board and which could equally well be delivered by some other member of his family or by some one commissioned to appear on his behalf. It seemed to the Committee quite superfluous to insist that the school board should require in every case the presence of the parent. It would be perfectly within the power of the school board to say that the person appearing on behalf of the parent did not satisfy them and that on some future occasion they must see the parent. It was perfectly open to the school board to use their discretion, and he could not enter into the frame of mind of hon. Gentlemen who could not leave a matter of this kind to be adjusted by the common sense, discretion, and experience of the members of the school boards. The words were inserted by the unanimous decision of the Committee after some discussion, and he hoped, if his hon. friend persisted in his objection, that they might be allowed to take the sense of the House upon the Amendment, which was not a point of great importance, and get to the next clause.

Amendment negatived.

MR. JAMES HOPE said that the result of the proposal in Clause 8 would be that once the exemption order was given, the child would be bound to attend up to the age of sixteen, and that would prejudice the prospects of that child's getting employment. That was an important objection to the first subhead, because a great liability would be incurred by the parent if the child between fourteen and sixteen years of age was not disposed to attend continuation classes. That liability did not appear to have been sufficiently realised. He objected to the third subsection on the ground that it sought to amend the Factory Act by a side wind, and any such Amendment as that ought to be done directly. The third subsection empowered school boards to make an order compelling a child to attend a continuation class which would prevent that child being employed during the hours allowed by the Factory Act. He objected to the fourth subsection on account of the extraordinary vagueness of the language. It was exceedingly difficult for a parent to regulate every movement of a child up to the age of fifteen, and ensure attendance at a continuation class. The operation of this clause would be exceedingly awkward in practice, and he begged to move the omission of Clause 8.

CAPTAIN CRAIG, in seconding, desired to emphasise the objection which had been raised to subsection (3), particularly in regard to children who might be employed in some subsidiary occupation assisting to earn a living. He knew of many families doing work at home such as handloom weaving which was looked upon as an adjunct to their ordinary labour. Subsection (3) would interfere with the harmonious working of children in such occupation where parents were trying to earn something above their ordinary wages. In some parts of Scotland and Ireland certain forms of employment would be forbidden altogether under this section. That appeared to be a hardship and would inevitably tend to drive a large amount of employment out of the country to the benefit of other countries where like conditions were not imposed. Many of the home industries of this country were very sensitive to legislation of this kind which interfered with small work like knitting and flowering, and some of the best work of this kind was done at home by children under the direction of their parents. Such work was not looked upon as work but as pleasure, which took them out of doors and at the same time helped to increase the family income. He had much pleasure in seconding the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 29, to leave out Clause 8."—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the end of line 38, page 5, stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR said that this clause was very fully discussed in Grand Committee where one or two suggestions were made by the critics of the clause and were accepted by the Government. It passed through the Committee without a division, which was a testimony to the unanimity of Scottish Members in its favour. It was a very simple clause which did not bring in the general question of continuation classes, but only as regards exempted children. Under the provisions of the Act to which he had already alluded, children were exempted at the age of twelve from compulsory attendance, and those children compensated for that in later years by attending evening continuation classes. This clause widened the discretion of school boards in insisting upon compensating attendance in later years. It was a very elastic proposal giving school boards a wide discretion and mitigating the burden upon the children. He was advised that in many parts of Scotland the clause would be a great advantage to the children and to the school boards in carrying out their present duties under the law. He had already explained the purpose of the clause. With regard to sub-clause (3) he agreed that there might be a danger of this school attendance being added to the period of work, and that would be too great a strain, but provision had been made to ensure that when a scholar was working under a statute which limited his work either in the mine or the factory, he would not have the school attendance added to his time, and there would be some adjustment to mitigate the burden.

*MR. COCHRANE said he could not help thinking that this clause was not only unnecessary but distinctly harmful. It was designed to extend the powers which school boards already possessed under Clause 3 of the Act of 1901, which provided that a child at the age of twelve might be exempted from attendance at school for part of the time if the parent applied to the school board. Under those circumstances the school board made certain conditions as to the attendance of that child at continuation schools up to the age of fourteen years. Under this clause it was now proposed to exercise that power up to the age of sixteen years, by which time the child might leave the parish altogether. Were they going to decide when the child was twelve years of age whether it was desirable that that child should attend a continuation class after the age of fourteen and up to the age of sixteen years? Many children at the age of fourteen had gone out into different parts of the country, and frequently the girls left home to seek employment in mills. In Paisley many of the girls came from a distance and got work there and attended voluntarily continuation classes, and yet it would be enacted by this clause that when they were twelve years of age they must go on attending continuation classes up to the age of sixteen. By doing that they might deprive those children of the possibility of earning a livelihood. Under this clause children might be obliged to leave their employment in order to attend a continuation class. Under Clause 9 school boards would have the fullest power to send children to continuation classes up to seventeen years of age, and this clause was absolutely unnecessary and harmful. It was really more stringent than Clause 9 and he would like to know how far the jurisdiction of the school board would extend. In the case of a child over fourteen years who had left the parish, would the order made be effective in any part of Scotland? The school board could order compulsory attendance in the case of a child up to the age of fourteen years, and he wanted to know whether they could compel a child to attend beyond fourteen years of age if he had gone to live in another parish. There was no limit as to distance. Under Clause 9 there was a very salutary and proper provision, more especially in view of the fact that these classes might be held at night, that no young person should be required to attend a class beyond two miles from his residence. There was no such provision in Clause 8 of this Bill, and he would like to know whether a school board could compel a child to attend beyond the distance of two miles. He thought that was a very important point. Take the case of a farm lad who might be ordered to attend a continuation class. Under this clause he might have to walk ten miles. He ventured to say that the clause was absolutely unnecessary. Why had the Lord Advocate adopted a limit of sixteen under this clause and seventeen under the next clause, when both dealt with compulsory attendance at continuation classes? He felt perfectly certain that this clause would prevent many boys and girls from taking up employment in mills and factories and domestic service because they might be compelled to attend continuation classes. He asked the Lord Advocate to reply to those points.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that a good many of the difficulties brought forward by his hon. friend were initiated by the late Government by the Act of 1901 which provided for relieving children from full attendance at school after twelve years of ago. This clause provided that where relief from school attendance was given after that age the board should have power to impose certain conditions as to attendance at a day school or a suitable continuation class afterwards. They were not dealing here with such cases as the hon. Member opposite had described; they were dealing with the actual case in which a school board was confronted with an application by a parent who said that in the interest of the child and the family he should be released from the obligation of continuing to send his boy to school until he had reached the age of fourteen. It was hardly possible that there could be a greater loss to young people than would result from the excision of this clause from the Bill. The second question asked was why the Government had selected sixteen as the age for leaving the continuation classes. The present requirement was that full attendance should be given up to the age of fourteen. If a child was relieved from full attendance at twelve, the assumption was that he would become a half-timer. If they were to give two years release from full attendance it was only right that there should be four years attendance at the continuation classes in order that that child might be as well equipped educationally as the one who had given full attendance up to fourteen. The final question had reference to subsection (3) which prescribed that the hours of employment should not exceed a certain amount. The position the Government took up with regard to that was this: There were various Acts of Parliament which prescribed a statutory maximum number of hours which might be worked in mines and factories. If a child was relieved from full school atendance at twelve years of age and admitted to the full maximum labour allowed in a factory, the strain on the little frame of the child might be too much if, when his work was done, he had to go to a continuation class. They must, therefore, reckon the education period into the maximum factory time so that the physical condition of the young person might not be injured.

Sir PHILIP MAGNUS said he had full sympathy with the object of the clause, but it seemed to him that it was rather clumsily worded. He was not a member of the Standing Committee that considered the Bill, and he did not quite understand from what had been said what was to be done in the case of children between twelve and fourteen. He had no doubt proper provision was made in the Bill, but it was difficult to read into the clause as it now appeared what was meant. That was one of the difficulties which arose from having so short a time for the discussion of so important a Bill as this. There were many Amendments one would like to introduce into the Bill, not with the view of wrecking it as had been suggested by one member of the Government, but with the object of improving the measure. It seemed to him in regard to this clause that no distinct provision was made as to the continued education which a child was to receive between twelve and sixteen years of age. He understood the Lord Advocate to say that it was provided that an employer should allow every child in his employment sufficient time to enable him to profit by the instruction he would receive in the continuation classes. Unless employers in all cases were willing to allow time for that purpose, a great deal of the time given to the instruction in the continuation classes would be wasted. He would have liked to see clearer provision made in subsection (3) for the time allowed to children attending continuation classes, so that the receiving of instruction after their day's work might not be oppressive.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said there were two points on which the House wanted enlightenment. Subsection (4) imposed on the parent a penalty for neglecting to exercise due care. Supposing that a child at fifteen got useful and profitable employment some distance off, was the parent still to be under that penalty because the child was not attending the continuation class? The subsection would be very difficult to work, and was somewhat awkwardly expressed, and that raised some doubt as to the merits of the whole clause. In this clause a child which had been exempted from school attendance between the age of twelve and fourteen, was liable to attend a continuation class between the age of fourteen and sixteen, but in another clause the continuation class must be taken up to the age of seventeen. He wanted some explanation of that, and he trusted that the Secretary for Scotland would pardon him for stating the difficulties which had occurred to him.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he readily responded to the invitation of the hon. Gentleman, but he thought it would be convenient to defer consideration of Clause 9 until they came to it. Clause 9 gave a general power in regard to continuation classes which did not affect the provisions of Clause 8 in any way whatever. But Clause 8 did nothing more than amplify the present powers of the school boards under the Act of 1901 in providing for the continuance of the education of children who were exempted by the school board from attendance at an ordinary school between the ages of twelve and fourteen. In granting exemption from attendance at day schools between twelve and fourteen, the school board might lay down conditions as to attendance at continuation classes between the ages of fourteen and sixteen. The school board would say to the parent that the child should be relieved from compulsory attendance at the day school between twelve and fourteen, but that the child must attend such and such a class at such and such hours between fourteen and sixteen. The parent agreed to the terms of the arrangement and the school board made it after full knowledge of the local circumstances.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON asked if that bound the child to the school board area.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Not in the least. It was possible for a child to go to another area. The practice had sprung up in Scotland of school boards communicating with one another in regard to these matters; and they had provided for certificates of attendance being given from the school board of the area which the child left to the school board of the area to which he went. It was desirable that such communications should be continued so that the arrangement made with the original school board should be carried out in the new school board area to which the child went.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) wanted to know exactly what the clause meant. Were they to understand that a child when it had reached the age of twelve was exempted by the school board from full attendance at a day school for two years on condition that he was to go to a continuation school from fourteen to sixteen years of age?

Mr. SINCLAIR said that under the Act of 1901 attendance at day schools until the age of fourteen was already provided for.

Mr. ASHLEY said that if that were so, this clause was exceedingly badly drawn. The hon. Member for North Ayrshire had raised a question as to the distance a child might have to go to attend a continuation class. Would he have to go five or ten miles? The Lord Advocate had said that that was not so, as it was provided in Clause 9 that the child would not have to go more than two miles to a continuation school. But the Secretary for Scotland had told them that Clause 9 had no relation whatever to Clause 8. H thought that the Amendment of his hon. friend was a good one, and he would vote for it.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 148; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 370.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth,R. L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, Sir George
M‘Micking, Major G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA C.(Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N. (Donc't'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wason,Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
Morpeth, Viscount
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. James Hope and Mr. Ashley.

MR. BRIDGEMAN moved an Amendment to Clause 8 making it lawful for a school board in granting exemption from attendance at school under the Education Act of 1901 to impose as a condition attendance either at a day school, at a continuation class where available, or partly at one and partly at the other, after the age of fourteen years and until such age, not exceeding sixteen years, as the board might think fit. The Amendment was to omit the reference to fourteen years, and he moved it to draw attention to what seemed to him an opportunity for improvement in the clause, of which he thoroughly approved. As he understood Section 3 of the Act of 1901, the conditions which a school board might impose as the conditions under which exemption was given would only apply to attendance at a day school, and it was obviously intended by Clause 8 of the present Bill that the child between the years of twelve and fourteen should be able to attend at a day school, or at an evening school, or partly at one and partly at the other, whether its age was twelve, thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen. If it was not intended that the child should attend school at all between twelve and fourteen, then he thought the thing was quite wrong; whilst if it was desired that the child should attend between twelve and fourteen, it seemed eminently clear that the words "after the age of fourteen" were not only not necessary, but misleading. Therefore he moved the Amendment that stood in his name in order that the Secretary for Scotland might explain whether or not under the Act of 1901 attendance at continuation schools was available at all.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS seconded the Amendment in the belief that it would secure an explanation.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 39, to leave out the words 'after the age of fourteen years, and.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR said the matter was simple, and there was no such difficulty as the hon. Member seemed to find. After the age of fourteen years was reached, the child should be given a somewhat wider discretion as to the choice of opportunities for his education, and therefore it was necessary to insert the words referred to in the Amendment.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said his point was that it might be more convenient and better for a child between the ages of twelve and fourteen to go to an evening school instead of a day school. By putting in the words "after the age of fourteen" that was made impossible.

MR. SINCLAIR replied that if the hon. Gentleman knew the circumstances of education in Scotland he would not say that. The Act of 1901 had been found to work perfectly well, and he could assure the hon. Gentleman there was no ground for his fear of any child under the age of fourteen being able to avoid coming under the conditions of the clause.

Amendment negatived.

SIR F. BANBURY moved an Amendment to Clause 8 dealing with the penalties to be imposed on persons employing children above the age of fourteen at times when attendance at school or continuation classes is required, or for a greater number of hours than permitted. The Amendment was to modify the clause so that, instead of the penalty in the case of a second or subsequent offence not exceeding £5, it should not exceed 20s. where the conviction recurred at intervals of not less than three months. The hon. Member said he moved the Amendment because under the Act of 1872 the penalty was 20s., and it was provided that the penalty could not be repeated except at recurring periods of three months. There was no provision that on a separate offence the penalty might be increased. In the Act of 1878 an alteration was made and the penalty was increased to 40s., but the same proviso held good, that the penalty could only be inflicted at recurrent periods of three months and could not be increased. He did not know why this alteration should be made and the penalty increased in this particular instance when a child was over fourteen years, seeing that under the Acts of 1872 and 1878, in the case of a younger child, and therefore a worse offence, the penalty was not liable to be increased upon the subsequent offence. He would ask the learned Solicitor-General whether, if a person were convicted of knowingly employing a young person above the age of fourteen, and was fined 20s., it was the intention of the Government, if the same person employed another young person over fourteen years of age, that he should be fined £5 because it was a subsequent offence. There was nothing in the clause to provide that the second conviction should involve an increased penalty only if it were for employing the same child as was employed before. As he read the clause, if a person employed a fresh child the penalty was to be increased even to the extent of £5. He presumed that the intention of the Government was that if a person continued to employ the same child after a penalty had been inflicted, an increased penalty might be imposed, though under the section as it stood a larger penalty might be inflicted three or four years after the first conviction, because the same person knowingly employed a child which was not the same as in the first instance. He did not think that could possibly be intended by the Government, and therefore, unless an explanation were given upon the point, he must press the Amendment to a division. He begged to move.

CAPTAIN CRAIG seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 12, to leave out the words from the word 'shillings,' to end of subsection (3) of Clause 8, and insert the words 'and such procedure may be repeated against the same person, or in respect of the same offence, at intervals of not less than three months.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. THOMAS SHAW said that really this subsection applied to the case of an employer who was trafficking in child labour. He used the word "trafficking" deliberately, because the subsection so put it that no conviction could follow unless the act was knowingly done. What the Government proposed was that there should be a fine of 20s. in the first instance. If the person took the child into his employ the next week there could not be a more deliberate violation of the statute, and therefore it was quite clear that a substantial penalty should be imposed. The hon. Baronet opposite said, "But suppose after an interval he employs another young person." If he did a second time knowingly traffic in child labour, the House was not going too far in imposing the full penalty.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said if it was a serious offence—and no doubt they all agreed that it was a serious offence—for a parent to neglect the education of his child between five and fourteen years of age, was it an offence so much greater if the parent neglected the education of his child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen? Take the case of a widow who had a girl or boy of sixteen years of age; was she to be heavily fined if she "neglected to exercise due care"? What sort of due care could a widow exercise over a sturdy boy of sixteen? If the offence occurred a second time—if, for instance, she had not locked the door or insisted by the threat of some penalty on his going to school, was she to be fined £5? It was possible by increasing these penalties to an absurd extent to make them so ridiculous that they would really fail in effect altogether. The utmost penalty which at present existed, and for which it was not proposed to make any additional penalty under this Bill, for absolutely neglecting the essential education of a child between the ages of five and fourteen was only 40s. Was there any reason, logic, or sound principle, in making a parent, who might have very little influence over a boy of sixteen—they knew what boys of sixteen were—subject to a penalty of £5 if the offence under this clause occurred a second time? For these reasons, and in order to produce a certain harmony between the different Acts of Parliament, he asked the Secretary for Scotland to make some concession.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the expression "trafficking in child labour" no doubt excited the sympathy of the House, although he thought it was somewhat far-fetched when applied to a boy or girl who was willing or anxious to be employed, and who was doing work which was useful or profitable to his or her family. Still, he was quite prepared to admit that if an employer knowingly employed a boy or girl contrary to the law the penalties would not be severe. But it had always been a matter of difficulty about these continuation classes to decide how a penalty for non-attendance could be properly imposed upon a parent or guardian, because a boy of sixteen or seventeen might be quite beyond the control of a widowed mother or an invalid father, and if a parent or guardian failed to exercise this sort of control, which he or she had not the physical power to enforce, it seemed that the penalties proposed were extremely severe. If the penalties could be altered in respect of parents or guardians he should be inclined to ask his hon. friend not to divide on this section.

MR. SINCLAIR pointed out that in subsection (4), relating to the neglect of the parent or guardian, a penalty would only be imposed for "wilful default or by habitually neglecting to exercise due care," and that would surely give the protection which the right hon. Gentleman desired.

Amendment negatived.

MR. SINCLAIR moved an Amendment to insert words to provide that the penalty for a second or subsequent offence should be imposed for an offence "whether relating to the same or to another young person."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 13, after the word 'offence,' to insert the words 'whether relating to the same or to another young person.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. JAMES HOPE moved to amend subsection (4) so as to confine the penalties for wilful default or habitual neglect to exercise due care, thereby committing an offence under subsection (3), to parents, and omitting the words "or guardian." Somewhat earlier in the Bill, he said he moved to add the words "or guardian," and he was then told that it was unnecessary because this Bill had to be read in conjunction with the Education Acts from 1872 downwards, and that the definition included guardian. He therefore thought the same expression ought to be used throughout, or it might be construed that a difference was intended.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 14, to leave out the words 'or guardian.'"—(*Mr. J. F. Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. SINCLAIR said he saw no objection to the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS moved an Amendment to the first subsection of Clause 9 to include in the subjects for which it should be the duty of a school board to make suitable provision of continuation classes for young persons above the age of fourteen, that of the domestic arts. The clause, he thought, was one of the most important in the whole Bill, and the first subsection indicated the subjects of instruction to be given in the continuation classes. Anyone who read the subsection would observe that the subjects of instruction referred rather to the occupations in which young men were likely to be engaged than to occupations in which young women over the age of fourteen were likely to be. His Amendment would definitely indicate that the requirements of women should be as carefully considered as those of men.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 27, after the word 'practised,' to insert the words 'and the domestic arts.'"—(*Sir Philip Magnus.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey) said that he put a new clause on the paper, relating to military drill, but it was ruled out of order, and, accordingly, he wished to move as an Amendment to the clause in the Bill to insert, in Clause 9, after the word "physical" the words "and in the case of male scholars military." The House would at once see that the object in view was to provide for military drill and instruction in the schools of Scotland. This was a matter to which he and many of his hon. friends attached a very great deal of importance. For his own part he thought the advantages that would accrue from the acceptance of the Amendment were twofold in character; in the first place there was the advantage to the individual and in the second place, the advantage to the State. He believed nobody to-day would deny the extreme importance of physical culture. It was important—almost essential—not from the point of view of the body alone, but from the point of view of the mind as well. The brain of a young child undoubtedly produced better results if working in conjunction with a robust well developed physical frame than it did if the body were weakly and circulation stagnant. The first object therefore of everybody interested in the education of children should be to provide for the simultaneous development of mind and body, to endeavour as a golden rule to obtain in the words of the Latin phrase *mens sana in corpore sano*. He was of opinion that there was no better exercise for either mind or body than regular military drill and military training. The Secretary of State for War no doubt would correct him if he was wrong, but he believed it was true to say that military drill and exercises as provided by the military authorities at the present time were based on the latest teachings of science and physiology, and were therefore calculated to be productive of the most beneficial results. He did not think anybody would deny that beneficial results accrued from regular training of that kind, and those who had studied the question of the physical degeneration of the people would not deny that even conscription had been advocated in the most unexpected quarters. He did not want for the moment to go so far as that, but it really seemed preposterous that the State, which had taken the education of the children of the country into its own hands, and subjected their minds to a sort of mental incubation, should refuse all responsibility for the development and culture of their bodies. An additional advantage was to be derived from the instruction taking the form of military exercise and training. It lay in the fact that such training inculcated in these citizens in embryo a due sense of their responsibility towards the State as a whole. He appealed with every confidence to hon. Members who sat below the gangway on that side of the House to support his hon. friends and himself in that Amendment. He did so because everyone admitted—and the Secretary of State for War amongst them—that if the Territorial Army scheme now on trial in the country was found wanting there would be no alternative but to resort to conscription. Rightly or wrongly, he did not care to say which, the idea was prevalent that conscription was distasteful to the representatives of labour in the House of Commons, and if that were so hon. Members below the gangway would see that it was to their interest to do everything that lay in their power to make the present Territorial Army scheme a success. He could not conceive of anything better calculated to make it a success than to imbue the minds of the children of the country with a proper idea of their responsibility towards the State, and encourage them to enlist in that force when they arrived at an age to do so. He wished to say a word or two as to the benefits that would result from the acceptance of his Amendment from the point of view of the State as a whole. He supposed nobody would deny that even at the present day brute force was the ultimate arbiter in the destinies of nations. He noticed that some hon. Members objected to that statement, but surely they were forgetful of recent events. It was only necessary to point to the war in Manchuria, to the struggle for supremacy in South Africa and to other events of modern times to prove that brute force was to-day as in the past, and, he would add, must be for a very long future, the ultimate arbiter of the destinies of nations. That being so it behoved them to do all they could to put our own country in the position of being able, should the need arise, adequately to defend herself against attacks from outside. He desired to point out in that connection that we were at the present time——

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the noble Lord that the subject under discussion is the curriculum of continuation classes.

Earl of RONALDSHAY said he was trying to put before the House the arguments which he thought would have most force in backing up his invitation to support the Amendment. His sole desire was to show the advantages that would be gained by calling upon the school boards of Scotland to make provision for military training and instruction for scholars in these continuation classes. As a Scotsman himself, or very largely a Scotsman, he had been proud of his countrymen in the past, and he was equally solicitous for their honour in the future. He hoped that hon. Members would not lightly reject the Amendment which he had put down and which he believed would do something to make good the rather obvious deficiencies of our military organisation.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, after the word 'physical,' to insert the words 'and in the case of male scholars military.'"—(*Earl of Ronaldshay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR HENRY CRAIK remarked that many arguments might be used in favour of this proposal. It might, for example, be urged with some confidence on the Secretary of State for War how powerful would be the additional assistance given to the great scheme which the right hon. Gentleman said was to make us "a nation under arms," but it was not his intention on the present occasion to urge the acceptance of this proposal as a matter of military organisation. He wished rather to press it as a matter of education. Apart from any question of the advancement and building up of the force created by the Secretary of State for War, he supported the Amendment for the sake of the children themselves. He believed nothing was more important than that they should lay down such a rule, and he would not leave the matter entirely to the school boards, or even to the department which they had heard so vigorously criticised that night, but he would have the training advocated by the noble Lord established as the result of an injunction by the High Court of Parliament. In that way, and in that way alone, could it be properly imposed on every child. Surely the superstition was gone by now that education consisted only of the teaching of books and black-boards, and the acquiring of certain snippets, more or ess satisfactory, of information. We of this generation had thought we had done well in adding to it an immense amount of what was called technical education. But surely those who took a deep interest in the question felt that do what they could, what was called education turned to husks in their mouth if there was not something behind it, some training of character. That training of character might come in various ways. They were told it was expressly provided in some of the rules of the department that teaching of the rights of citizenship was to be part of the curriculum, especially, he thought, of the continuation classes. Was it not a duty of citizenship that a boy should be taught to prepare himself to take his part in performing the duties of comradeship and to work with his comrades for his country's good? It was not merely by physical exercises, not merely by the amusements of the playground, but by the instruction of the drill sergeant, the learning of obedience, the training in organised movement, the awakening of the instincts of comradeship, that boys could best be taught the duty of service to the State. He wished to cull a few sentences from the writings of one whom he thought would gain some respect even from the hon. Members below the gangway. The words he was going to read were by Thomas Carlyle, and the House must admit that they were singularly appropriate—

"I always fancy there might much be done in the way of military drill withal. Beyond all other schooling, and as supplement or even as succedaneum for all other, one often wishes the entire population could be thoroughly drilled; into co-operative movement, into individual behaviour, correct, precise, and at once habitual and orderly as mathematics, in all, or in very many points—and ultimately in the point of actual military service, should such be required of it! That of commanding and obeying, were there nothing more, is it not the basis of all human culture; ought not all to have it; and how many ever do? I often say, the one official person, royal, sacerdotal, scholastic, governmental, of our times, who is still thoroughly a truth and a reality, and not in great part a hypothesis and worn-out humbug, proposing and attempting a duty which he fails to do—is the drill sergeant who is master of his work, and who will perform it."

He would conclude by reading one other passage, to his mind equally effective and convincing, from the same author—

> "But now, what is to hinder the acknowledged King in all corners of his territory, to introduce wisely a universal system of drill, not military only, but human in all kinds; so that no child or man born in his territory might miss the benefit of it—which would be immense to man, woman and child? I would begin with it, in mild, soft forms, so soon almost as my children were able to stand on their legs; and I would never wholly remit it till they had done with the world and me."

He commended these passages to the House with the conviction that they would appeal to hon. Members. These were the words of a wise teacher. They were words not to be regarded lightly. He was convinced that if they were to make the schools complete, that if they were to realise the ideals of the right hon. Gentleman and were to make the schools schools not only for imparting complete information but also real institutions for the training of character, they must introduce something in the nature of the military training asked for.

MR. HALDANE said that as the Amendment concerned him in some small degree, he proposed to deal with that side of it with which he was concerned. They were not there to discuss the advantages of physical drill, for that was provided for in the clause and also in the code. They were there to discuss military training, and the idea was that the military training which was to be introduced should stop at the age of seventeen. He knew that the hon. Member and noble Lord who had just spoken wished to promote the endeavours which had been made on both sides of the House to put our military system on a better footing. In his humble judgment, however, they could not deal a more deadly blow at that system than by carrying the Amendment. They were evidently mixing up the different sides of our voluntary system which began by voluntary enlistment at not less an age than seventeen. On that system of voluntary enlistment we were absolutely dependent in this country for a far larger overseas army than any other country was, and we could not get that army except by voluntary enlistment, for it meant a long period of service over-seas for which we could not get men by compulsion. Experience had shown that compulsion applied at an early age, or compulsion under moral persuasion such as sometimes took place in schools, was the most deadly enemy of voluntary enlistment. It was only by getting people to come forward under the influence of what was sometimes described as military measles that we could get our recruits. He believed that if the Amendment were carried, our existing voluntary system would be placed in great peril. The military training which was proposed could not be in itself adequate. The only point which he wished to emphasise was that the country which depended on voluntary enlistment for its overseas army, which was vital to the Empire, could deal no more deadly blow at that system than by imposing compulsion which was to stop at the age of seventeen.

MR. BARNES said that as he had listened to the noble Lord who had moved the Amendment, and to the hon. Gentleman who had seconded it, it had occurred to him that their speeches would have been more appropriate had not the last sentence of the first section of Clause 9 been in the Bill. But that particular part of the Bill provided it shall be the duty of the board—

> "To make provision for their instruction in the laws of health, and to afford opportunity for suitable physical training."

So far as he had understood the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Amendment, they had been directed for nine-tenths of the time to advocating physical training, and there had therefore been no need for the Amendment. The tenth part which had been in favour of military training had, he thought, made out only a very poor case for it. The noble Lord had said that it was necessary to have military drill because he wanted to put into the minds of the boys some idea of their relationship and duties to the State. If they wanted to get that relationship between the boy and the State set up, the State must do its duty to the boy a good deal better than it had done in the past. If that had been done, they on those benches believed that no compulsion would have been necessary. Nothing of the nature contemplated by the mover of the Amendment should be necessary to introduce a proper spirit into the youths of this country. It was perfectly true, as had been stated by the noble Lord, that contests between nations were inevitable. It was unfortunate that that should be the case, but it was true. It was therefore his desire that the youths of the country should be trained as well as it was possible to train them. He wished to remind hon. Members, and especially those among whom he sat, that they had been pleading for the State to do its duty in feeding the children and finding employment for the men. If that were done, they would have done a great deal more to achieve the object of the Amendment than anything in the nature of compulsory military training could do. He and his colleagues on the Labour benches were opposing the Amendment because they thought that it was unnecessary, seeing that the same object could be achieved by providing for the feeding of the children and for employment for the men.

MR. ASHLEY said that, as he understood the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, it was that if the Amendment were accepted they would be putting distaste for military service into the minds of the young men of the country. His argument had been that compulsion was a bad thing and would give distaste for military service, and that they would therefore have great difficulty in getting recruits for the Regular Army, the Territorial Army, and the Auxiliary Forces generally. He absolutely disagreed with the views which the right hon. Gentleman had expressed. He had been to school at Harrow, where compulsory football was in operation, but nobody would get up in that House and say that those who had been obliged to play football at Harrow would not play it after they had left Harrow and had passed on to the University. People were just as keen to play football whether it was compulsory or whether it was not. They might just as well say that because French and German were compulsory subjects at some schools nobody would speak French or German after they had left school. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the military training which had been suggested would be no use at all to the young men who joined the Army or Auxiliary Forces. He and friends of his who had been drilled when they were at school, though perhaps the drill had not been as efficient as it ought to have been, had found it extremely useful when they had joined the Regular Army or the Militia, and he again therefore disagreed with the right hon. Gentleman when he said that that military training would not be useful in after-life. If the boys in the schools in Scotland were given a certain amount of military training while they were at continuation classes up to the age of seventeen, it would very much improve their physique, and though he did not think military training was as good as physical exercises, he considered that a combination of the two would be most valuable and most useful to the boys when they joined the Regular Army or Auxiliary Forces. The right hon. Gentleman knew how important it was to improve the physique of the young, for he was aware how it was deteriorating. The physique of the young men who came into the Special Reserve now was miserable. The right hon. Gentleman shook his head at that statement. Having seen these young men, he must again disagree with the right hon. Gentleman. They had most valuable instances of the good that could be done by military training furnished by other countries. He himself last year when travelling in Sweden had had the advantage of going over several of the schools where the boys from fourteen to seventeen years of age were receiving military training. They were drilled every day and received instruction in the use of the rifle. Sweden was a most democratic country, and there was therefore nothing inconsistent with a democratic system in that military training. They hoped for the very best results from the adoption of what the Amendment sought to give, and if the noble Lord pressed it to a division he would certainly support him in the lobby.

*MR. R. DUNCAN thought the quotation from Carlyle which had been read to the House was worthy of the greatest attention, and should carry great weight with the Government. They wanted to inspire the youths of the country with the right spirit. What was it that had given the Japanese their power? It was the military training and the determination to face death if necessary for their nation. Our nation could only hold its place by adopting a system under which a child must be trained up as a citizen of the State, ready to give his life, if necessary, for the State. The Secretary of State for War said that that spirit was not developed by training the youth of the country in the use of arms. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was quite mistaken. What was the experience with other nations? Did they find that when the youths were trained to the use of arms, to face even the possibility of death, their fibre was weakened? No; speaking as an employer he asserted that the nations they had to fear as employers—and it was a wholesome fear—the nations that did better than ourselves, were the nations whose men were ready to give their lives for their country, and who were willing to undergo discipline and drilling. Those were the competitors they had to fear.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 27; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 371.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt HnSir Alex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander

Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Forster, Henry William
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Renwick, George

Ridsdale, E. A.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Earl of Ronaldshay and Sir Henry Craik.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Herbert
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett,C H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)

Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithness-sh
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp

Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas

Murray,Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards, T.F (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Haw ickB.)
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Captain CRAIG moved an addition to Clause 9 making it the duty of a school board to make suitable provision for the teaching of the National Anthem and the emblematic meaning of the national flag. The hon. Member intimated that in consequence of the lateness of the hour he did not intend to advance any of the arguments he had ready in commending the Amendment to the House, but would content himself with appealing to what he felt was the feeling in all parts of the House, even below the gangway, that the youth of the country should be given as many facilities as possible for being taught in early years the National Anthem and the true emblematic meaning of the national flag. He felt sure that the Amendment was such as to commend itself to the whole House without any speech in support.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, at the end, to insert the words 'and for the teaching of the National Anthem and the emblematic meaning of the national flag.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) confessed that he found himself in great perplexity as to how he should vote upon the Amendment in view of the very meagre explanation which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had given of the very remarkable proposal which he had upon the Order Paper of the House. He did not understand it. It was proposed to provide for the teaching of the emblematic meaning of the national flag. He believed that the emblem on the national flag of Scotland was a lion rampant, or a lion couchant, or something of that kind, and he would like to know whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman proposed to have kindergarten lessons given to the students on the meaning of the different sorts of lions. It might be true that some people rushed in where Scotsmen feared to tread, but the hon. and gallant Gentlemen did not seem to be aware of the fact that from 1816 to 1853, a fierce controversy raged in Scotland as to what the national flag was, and the controversy was not settled yet. A great complaint was made by the people of Edinburgh, and a petition presented to the House, that the Cross of St. Andrew was put behind the Cross of Saint George, and that a great indignity had therefore been inflicted upon the people of Scotland. That protest was subsequently taken up by the Town Council of Brechin and a special inquiry had to be held by the Garter King of Arms, and from that day to this the Garter King had never published his decision. But that was not the only point on which he was obscure. The hon. and gallant Gentleman proposed that no school should receive any grant unless the children had been taught to sing the National Anthem. What was the National Anthem of Scotland? He heard a chorus of: "Scots wha hae?" He had frequently been to gatherings in Scotland political and other, and he found that the meetings finished up with nothing except "Auld Lang Syne," and so far as he could see that was the National Anthem of Scotland. He was seriously afraid that unless the hon. and gallant Gentleman defined his meaning he would be subjected to serious misunderstanding and misrepresentation in Scotland. The people of the country would believe he meant the English National Anthem, and he was sure nothing could be further from his intention than to offer an insult of that sort to the people of Scotland. He also thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman should sweep in front of his own doorstep before he dealt with the affairs of the people of Scotland. He said that because he happened to be in the hon. and gallant Gentleman's constituency in East Down on Trafalgar Day, and he could assure him that the national flag was not flying from any Orange hall, brewery, or distillery in the whole concern. Unless the hon. and gallant Gentleman could see his way either by himself or through some of his friends to offer a concise and intelligent explanation as to what he meant by this Amendment he should be reluctantly compelled to vote against him.

Amendment negatived.

Sir HENRY CRAIK moved to omit subsection (3) of Clause 9, which made it lawful for a school board to make, vary, and revoke bye-laws for requiring the attendance at continuation classes, until an age not exceeding seventeen years, of young persons above the age of fourteen within their district who were not otherwise receiving a suitable education, or were not specially exempted by the school board from the operations of the bye-laws. The hon. Member said he did not wish to press his Amendment at that time, but he would like the Secretary for Scotland to answer one or two questions. Why was it in this case that the maximum age was seventeen and not sixteen? Furthermore, who was to be responsible, and what penalty would be imposed in the case of a boy over sixteen and under seventeen who did not attend a continuation school?

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 3, to leave out subsection (3) of Clause 9."—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'seventeen,' in page 7, line 5, stand part of the Bill."

*Sir PHILIP MAGNUS drew attention to the words "suitable education" in the subsection, and remarked that in Clause 6, upon which so much discussion arose in the earlier part of the debate, the words "efficient education" occurred. He did not vote for the introduction of the word "elementary," although he was not satisfied with the word "efficient." If the right hon. Gentleman could go back and use the word "suitable" instead of "efficient" in Clause 6, it would be an improvement, he thought.

Mr. SINCLAIR said the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken would perhaps recollect that in employing the word "efficient" in Clause 6 they were following an earlier Act of Parliament. In this clause they were providing for the establishment of continuation classes, and the words in question were considered by the Committee upstairs to meet the case, and he did not think there was any reason for differing from the decision of the Committee in this respect. In regard to the question asked by the hon. Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities, as to how they were to enforce the clause——

Sir HENRY CRAIK: Why seventeen instead of sixteen?

Mr. SINCLAIR said it was for this reason: This was not part of the machinery of instruction at present in Scotland. They were asking the school boards to establish continuation classes, and they were giving power to school boards to make bye-laws which would require the attendance of some persons at these continuation classes. Their attendance need not be required until the age of seventeen, but it was eminently desirable that school boards should have a margin of three years, namely, from fourteen to seventeen, to work upon. In some districts circumstances might suggest that continuation classes should not begin until the full age of seventeen. This kind of teaching would involve a school board in considerable expense in the way of staff, accommodation, etc., and it might possibly be that with the margin of three years they might not be able to organise on an efficient scale. It was essential that the age should be left as it was, and he would appeal to the House even at that very late hour not to restrict the clause. It had undergone very careful discussion in Committee. They had looked at it from every point of view, and the Committee had deliberately come to the decision that the clause should stand as it did; and when the House recollected, as it must, that one great cause of unemployment from which the country was suffering at the present time was the absence of instruction and facilities for instruction, of young people between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, which tended to their drifting into the casual labour market, he hoped the House would not in any degree curtail facilities, which were enabling facilities, to school boards to cope with the difficulties with which they had to deal. The penalties to be imposed by the clause, in regard to employers, were set out in subsection (5), and in regard to parents and guardians in subsection (6). They discussed in Committee how far they should hold a parent or guardian responsible for a young person of sixteen who refused to comply with an order requiring his attendance, and those Members who were on the Committee would remember there was a provision that the young person himself or herself should be proceeded against. That, after discussion, was withdrawn from the clause, and they were now left with the powers contained in the two subsections he had mentioned. It must be remembered, too, that these powers would be exercised by the school board with the full knowledge of local circumstances, and he thought that there was every reason to believe that they would be exercised with discretion and judgment.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he had taken no part so far in this debate, and he hoped he might be excused if he intervened for a moment or two. He took a strong line on this part of the clause, when it was dealt with in Committee. He thought then, and still thought, that seventeen was too high an age, and that sixteen was quite high enough. He did not think school boards should have the right or power to require young persons to remain in continuation classes until seventeen years of age, and he could give as an example the difficulty that would have arisen in his own case if his guardians had sent him to a continuation class up to seventeen years of age. Power was taken in a previous clause to keep young people, who had missed one or two years of their educational training, at school until sixteen years of age, and yet in this clause compulsory power was to be given to keep them at continuation classes until seventeen years of age, although they had been at school all the time. That seemed ridiculous. If it had been the other way about there might be some reason for it. He did not, however, think it was any use dividing the House on the question. The right hon. Gentleman would be supported as usual by his battalions who were generally very docile on these questions, but he still thought the age ought to be sixteen and not seventeen.

*Mr. COCHRANE thought this clause was one which ought to be discussed at considerable length. It established compulsory training up to seventeen for all children. He did not, however, propose to detain the House at that hour, but merely to say that as regards compulsory powers he thought they might do a great deal of harm to continuation classes. He knew many continuation classes in Scotland, and they were attended by boys and girls who got an excellent education from them. If, however, those who went voluntarily and willingly were going to have imposed upon them a certain number who went against their will the classes would be wrecked. To make these classes compulsory would do away, in his opinion, with a great deal of the advantage of the continuation schools and would be detrimental to education in Scotland.

MR. JAMES HOPE said he had an Amendment on the Paper to insert sixteen in place of seventeen; but for the reasons which his hon. friend had given he did not propose to move it. Before the Bill took final shape he would like to ask whether it was a desirable thing to make a girl of sixteen walk four miles—two miles each way—along a country road on a winter's evening to attend one of these classes.

Amendment negatived.

MR. SINCLAIR moved an Amendment to subsection (5) to provide that the penalty in the case of a second or subsequent offence should take effect "whether relating to the same or to another young person."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 37, after the word 'offence,' to insert the words 'whether relating to the same or to another young person.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Cochrane.

MR. SINCLAIR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said he was sure they all welcomed the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, but it should be understood, he thought, that it was made distinctly on the understanding that the debate was to be renewed upon another day, but not a Saturday, and that a full afternoon debate, namely, up to 8.15 o'clock, was to be given for the remainder of this stage of the Bill. The House had been engaged for ten hours on nine clauses of the Bill, and many of the remaining clauses were opposed by hon. Members from Scotland on the Government side of the House, and, therefore, he thought, the Opposition were making a great concession in limiting the debate to the one afternoon. However, hon. Members opposite had been so silent to-day that perhaps they would continue their silence on a future occasion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be further considered this day.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes before Two o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 11th November, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

INDIA (TRADE).

Review of the trade of India in 1907–1908.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4164. France (Algeria).
No. 4165. Japan (Yokohama).

WESTERN PACIFIC.

Correspondence relating to the administration of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate.

DOCK LABOUR IN RELATION TO POOR LAW RELIEF.

Report to the President of the Local Government Board on dock labour in relation to poor law relief, by the Hon. Gerald Walsh, one of the inspectors of the Board.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH.

LORD HENEAGE rose to move to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House British vessels should not be prohibited from trawling in waters outside the territorial limits of Scotland where foreign vessels are able to come in and use the fishing ground; and that any bye-laws now prohibiting British vessels from fishing in such waters should be withdrawn, and the open sea restored to the mutual condition in which it formerly existed under International law and the provisions of the North Sea Convention of 1882."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the Motion which stands in my name has been placed on the Paper at the unanimous request of the whole fishing industry of Great Britian represented in the National Sea Fisheries Association. There was no division of opinion amongst them whatever, either politically or otherwise. The Resolution to which they agreed, on which this Motion is founded, was proposed by one of the delegates from Aberdeen, and was supported by four other delegates from Scotland and by representatives from Grimsby, Fleetwood, Hull, Milford Haven, and other great fishing ports. I do not desire to waste your Lordships' time by repeating what has been said before on this question, but I would ask you to allow me to recall the history of the bye-laws to which I refer.

In 1888 the Royal Commission on Trawling reported that—

> "the beam trawl is not destructive to cod or haddock spawn, and there is no proof of injury to the spawn of herrings or other edible fish.",

They, however, recommended that the fishery authorities in England and Scotland should have powers to enable them to make bye-laws for the regulation and supervision of beam trawling or other modes of fishing "within territorial waters." The last three words are really the subject of this debate. The Report was fully discussed by the fishery trade at a very representative conference held at Fishmongers' Hall on March 22, 1888, and attended by nearly 200 persons connected with the trade, amongst whom were a large number of Members of both Houses of Parliament. At that conference a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of the recommendation of the Royal Commission to give fishing authorities power to regulate and suspend trawling within territorial waters.

Then in 1889 the Secretary for Scotland introduced the Herring Fishery Bill, and I will quote his own words on the Second Reading. Lord Lothian said—

> "I have referred this question to the Fishery Board for their advice and opinion as to the propriety of closing the whole of the territorial waters against trawling, and after inquiry they recommended that that course should be taken; it is with that object that the present Bill was introduced into the House of Commons and now comes before your Lordships, and I trust that your Lordships will pass it practically without Amendment,"

—that was, for territorial waters only. So that your Lordships will see that the Royal Commission, the fishing industry, and the Scottish Fishery Board up to that time had never intended for a single moment that rules should be made applicable to anything but territorial waters. It stands to common sense that it should be so, because no single Power has the slightest right to attempt to regulate the waters of the open sea.

Now, what are the territorial waters? They are commonly known as the three-mile limit; and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy (Lord Fitzmaurice) in answering a Question put to him eighteen months ago by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, stated that the Imperial Departments which had most to do with sea fisheries were all agreed on the question of the three-mile limit and knew exactly what it was. But in regard to the North Sea we have a Convention as well as International Law. In the North Sea Convention of 1882, embodied in the first schedule of the Sea Fisheries Act of 1883, it is clearly laid down, in Article II., that—

> "As regards bays the distance of three miles shall be measured from a straight line drawn across the bay in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten miles;"

and in Article IV. the limits of the North Sea are definitely fixed, and the boundaries of the Scottish territorial waters clearly set out in subsections (3) and (7). Therefore there can be no mistake whatever about the territorial waters in the North Sea.

The question of any claim to regulate the open sea is a matter which appears to me more for the Foreign Office than for the Scottish Office. It is one which will have to be dealt with in regard to the other signatories to the North Sea Convention; and we were told the other night in very strong terms by the Prime Minister that no International contract between Powers could be revoked by one of them at their own pleasure without the consent of the other parties to the treaty. This convention was a treaty in every sense of the word. There is another article in that treaty in which it is stated that no single signatory Power shall withdraw from the convention without one year's notice. But what happened in 1902? Nothing was done with regard to extra territorial waters up to 1902, and then without any notice of withdrawal from the convention, the Scottish Fishery Board enclosed large stretches of the open sea in Moray Firth and other bays round the coast against the trawlers of all nations in direct violation of their treaty rights in the North Sea.

The Scottish Office asserted that they could exclude all trawlers. I think they have found out by this time that they cannot. They also stated that they desired to close the Moray Firth in order to enable them to carry out scientific research. I may mention that no attempt has been made, or is now being made, to carry out scientific experiments. As Professor Machintosh said at the Sea Fishery Conference at Aberdeen—

> "They might keep British trawlers out, but could not keep fish in the Moray Firth;"

that is a question of currents. The Scottish Office also asserted that they wished to preserve the rights of fishing to the poor line fishermen. Some fifteen years ago the fishermen of Moray Firth owned about seventy cranky old sailing boats; they never ventured far out, and the great value of these fishermen was that they were always at home on election days. Now there are very few of these fishermen and these old boats remaining. Their place has been taken by a large capitalist fleet of 503 steam vessels for line fishing, worth £400,000, and when not fishing in the Moray Firth they go right away and bring back profitable catches of halibut and cod. But they are engaged chiefly in herring fishing, and it is for the benefit of the capitalists who own these vessels that you are preserving the Moray Firth.

I do not ask your Lordships to accept my statement uncorroborated. I will quote from the evidence of the Chief Clerk to the Scottish Fishery Board, who, in cross-examination before the Committee on Fishery Investigations in December last, said, in answer to a question by Lord Nunburnholme, that—

> "Line fishing is not now prosecuted to the same extent in the Moray Firth that it was at that time [before the Moray Firth was closed] because the fishermen find that the herring fishing pays them very much better; it does not entail so much labour as the line fishing; the result is that the best fishermen we have in the Moray Firth now devote almost all their time to the herring fishing, leaving only the older men and the younger men to prosecute line fishing, etc. The great majority of those who go to the English fishing are the Moray Firth boats."

So that not only is the Moray Firth preserved for Moray Firth fishing boats, but they are allowed to go and fish in the extra territorial waters of England, while English boats are not permitted to go to the extra territorial waters of Scotland. That does not strike me as fair play.

But if the Moray Firth line steamers do not care about spending too much of their time in the Moray Firth, what is the case with foreign vessels? Fifteen or sixteen foreign trawlers—French, German, Dutch, Norwegian, and Danish—regularly fish the bay for six or seven months in the year; on the west coast of Scotland some twenty foreign vessels are regularly fishing in the prohibited waters, and amongst those working the Clyde and other prohibited waters, and steaming out of Fleetwood, are nine German trawlers owned by four different firms, and two Dutch trawlers with vessels of other nationalities. I should like again to impress upon your Lordships that the days of "single fleeting" are gone by, and that the fishing vessels of the present time, whether trawlers or line steamers, are owned by large companies. Their shareholders, debenture holders, and mortgagees are scattered over the length and breadth of the country; the companies are managed by directors, the same as railway and other companies, and they have their own recognised fish salesmen in the various ports to which they take their fish.

I have dealt with the facts of the case from the point of view of the fishing industry; but I must ask your Lordships to allow me very briefly to deal with the International and treaty side of the question. In 1901 the local authorities of Iceland passed very similar laws for enclosing extra territorial waters. They claimed to have jurisdiction over waters outside the limits as prescribed by the North Sea Convention and International law, but the National Sea Fisheries Association remonstrated and brought the matter before the Foreign Office. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, who was then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, intervened, and I am glad to say that the Danish Government acknowledged the justice of his intervention against a violation of the North Sea Convention and International Law, and refused to ratify these local laws. In 1906 Mr. Sinclair, emboldened by the decisions of the High Court, prosecuted foreign vessels and obtained convictions; but Sir Edward Grey said that they must be released as the convictions—

> "under the Act of Parliament as interpreted by the High Court of Justiciary were in conflict with International law,"

and, I would add, in conflict with the spirit and the intention of the Act of 1889, as declared by Lord Lothian on the Second Reading.

I will not detain your Lordships with any further remarks of my own on this question, but I should like to read two letters from the Foreign Office. On 12th February last year I wrote to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs protesting against the prosecution of Norwegian vessels, and I received the following reply, dated February 16th—

> "I am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant, respecting the cases of the Norwegian and Swedish fishermen who have recently been convicted by the Courts in Scotland for trawling in the Moray Firth. I am to state, for your Lordship's information, that the men imprisoned have now been released, and that Sir E. Grey is in communication with Mr. Secretary Sinclair with a view to all further prosecutions being stopped pending a consideration of the whole question by His Majesty's Government."

What I want to know now is, what is the result of such consideration by the united Cabinet? I do not wish to have the opinion of the Scottish Office, but the opinion of the Cabinet. In March, 1907, the National Sea Fisheries Association passed unanimously the following resolution—

> "That this association urges upon His Majesty's Government the great importance to the fishing industry of maintaining the three-mile International territorial limits as now defined; and that the Minister for Foreign Affairs be asked to receive a deputation after Easter."

I would call your Lordships' particular attention to Sir Edward Grey's reply, dated March 20th—

> "I am directed by Secretary Sir E. Grey to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst., transmitting a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of the general committee of your association respecting 'the great importance to the fishing industry of maintaining the three-mile International territorial limits as now defined.' I am to state that Sir E. Grey is not aware that His Majesty's Government have on any occasion failed to recognise the validity of the existing International law respecting the limits of territorial waters, and that there is, therefore, no occasion for him to receive a deputation on this point."

Is that the opinion of the Government, or only the opinion of the Foreign Office? We know that the Foreign Office is not a political office, and that as a rule there is continuity of policy. I should like to know whether we who have to manage the affairs of the sea fisheries are to find the answers to the questions we ask in the replies of the Scottish Office or in those of the Foreign Office.

I will not refer now to the serious loss of employment to British fishermen; but I would ask your Lordships to consider what would be the effect if the other Powers in the North Sea followed the example of the Scottish Office. The effect would be to close waters equal to one-fifth of the whole of the North Sea. And what would the closing of one-fifth of the North Sea mean to the fishing industry of this country? It would mean total and absolute ruin. In proof of the fact that this retaliation is no idle dream, I would refer your Lordships to what took place at the New York Fishery Congress last month. Great Britain was not officially represented there, I believe—my noble friend will correct me if I am wrong—but Mr. Fryer, the chief inspector of the Fishery Department, was present, and therefore no doubt the Fishery Department have received a correct Report of what took place. It was pointed out there that the action of England in the Moray Firth was—

> "inconsistent with England's position at the Seal Fisheries Arbitration relating to the Behring Sea, as in the Moray Firth England claims jurisdiction over vessels under a foreign flag at a distance of seventy or eighty miles from the coast."

It was further pointed out that the present claim of England was at direct variance with the principles laid down by the International Court of Arbitration at Paris; and it was further suggested that if England persisted in her present position it might result in similar claims being set out by other nations and a complete change in the now recognised reading of International law on the question of territorial jurisdiction at sea. This would be a most serious matter for England.

In conclusion, I assert that the bye-laws of the Scottish Fishery Board are inconsistent with International law; that they constitute a violation of the North Sea Convention as regards the open waters of the North Sea; that they are directly opposed to the spirit and intention of the Act of 1889, and contrary to the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1895, as amended by Lord Salisbury; that no attempt has been made to conduct scientific research in the Moray Firth, and that the right of all nations to fish in the prohibited waters outside the territorial limits is now fully admitted by the Scottish Office. Therefore the pledge given by Lord Tweedmouth should now be redeemed. I beg to move.

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House British vessels should not be prohibited from trawling in waters outside the territorial limits of Scotland where foreign vessels are able to come in and use the fishing ground; and that any bye-laws now prohibiting British vessels from fishing in such waters should be withdrawn, and the open sea restored to the mutual condition in which it formerly existed under International law and the provisions of the North Sea Convention of 1882."—(*Lord Heneage.*)

LORD EVERSLEY: My Lords, I rise to second the Motion of my noble friend opposite. My noble friend has dealt so fully with the whole case that it will not be necessary for me to trouble your Lordships at any length; but there is one point to which my noble friend did not refer, but which I think it may be well to bring to the notice of your Lordships. I allude to the action which your Lordships' House took in 1895 upon the Sea Fisheries Act of that year, when, at the instance of the late Lord Salisbury, the House affirmed the principle of equal treatment of British and foreign trawlers and fishermen on the open sea in a manner which, I think, is exactly applicable to the case now before us.

I may remind your Lordships that up till the year 1895 nobody ever dreamt that foreign trawlers would come to English waters. There had never been such a case, and nobody expected that it would occur. I believe I am right in saying that the late Lord Salisbury was the first who ever suggested the possibility or the probability of foreign trawlers coming to fish in our waters. The Sea Fisheries Bill of that year as it came from the other House contained a provision under which the Scottish Fishery Board were empowered to extend the prohibition of trawling up to a limit of thirteen miles. Lord Salisbury pointed out that that clause would be absolutely invalid as against foreign trawlers. He said that by International law it was absolutely certain that foreign trawlers had the right of fishing up to the three-mile limit and that no municipal law of this country could deprive them of that right. He added that if the clause passed in its then shape the extraordinary result might follow that foreign trawlers might fish freely within the prohibited zone, whereas British trawlers would be forbidden to do so. Lord Salisbury spoke of this in very strong language. He said—

> "As the Bill stood there was nothing to prevent a stretch of the sea being declared in which foreigners might trawl and Englishmen might not. He could not conceive that such a state of things could be endured. Would it be reasonable, if a trawler were sighted some eight miles from land and a Queen's ship were sent to stop him, that while the vessel was being brought in a French trawler was able to take fish exactly on the same ground with impunity? He felt sure there would be an outburst of extreme indignation if such a scandal were permitted."

The late Duke of Argyle used language of almost equal strength. He pointed out that it would be a perfect scandal if foreign trawlers were allowed to fish in waters where British trawlers were prohibited. The only answer made by the Government in 1895 was that it was extremely unlikely that foreign trawlers would ever come and fish within the thirteen-mile limit. I think it is worth while quoting what was said by the late Lord Kimberley on the point. He said—

> "I may mention that the whole of the Moray Firth is now subject to this prohibition. I regret that there is not in that case an option given to the Secretary of State to suspend the prohibition should it be found that foreign trawlers fish there."

It will be seen, therefore, that Lord Kimberley considered that it was not possible to prevent foreign trawlers from fishing in the Moray Firth, and, further, he expressed the opinion that if thereafter foreign trawlers should be found fishing there it would be impossible to maintain the bye-law of the Scottish Fishery Board against British trawlers.

That is the case now before us, and which seems to have been exactly predicted by Lord Salisbury and Lord Kimberley. In consequence of Lord Salisbury's statement an Amendment was inserted in the clause, at his instance, providing that this prohibition of trawling within the thirteen-mile limit should only take effect when all the signatories to the North Sea Fisheries Convention of 1883 should have given their consent to it, so that their fishermen might be bound; and as that consent has never been given the clause has been a nullity, and has never been acted upon. But since then, as I have said, the predictions of Lord Salisbury have been fulfilled, and foreign trawlers in increasing numbers have, during the last three or four years, fished in the Moray Firth and the Firth of Clyde. I believe I am right in saying that in the first instance these were, in fact, British vessels, although sailing under the Norwegian flag; but in later years other vessels of a much more *bona fide* foreign character have fished there, and I am told that during last summer no fewer than fourteen foreign steam trawlers, Danish, German, Dutch, French, and Norwegian, habitually fished in the Moray Firth, and some twenty in the Firth of Clyde. In point of fact, as many foreign trawlers have been fishing in these two firths as used to be the case with British trawlers before the prohibition to which I have referred.

The Scottish Fishery Board met this proceeding in the first instance by prosecuting the masters of the foreign trawlers. At the beginning of 1907 they prosecuted six masters of Norwegian trawlers. The Scottish Law Courts sustained the conviction, and confirmed the principle, so far as they could, that the Moray Firth was an arm of the sea to which the municipal law of Scotland applied, and which was not under the rule of International law. This led to remonstrance and to diplomatic action on the part of the Norwegian Government, and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, felt himself compelled to yield to the remonstrance and to direct that the fishermen who had been imprisoned in consequence of the infraction of this law should be released; and I think I am right in saying that he indicated that no more prosecutions of that kind should take place against foreign trawlers. There have been, more lately, prosecutions in respect of seamen who have been found on board foreign trawlers; but I believe that since the decision of the Foreign Office there have been practically no prosecutions of foreigners for trawling in the Moray Firth or in any of the prohibited areas of Scotland.

The result is that there is the state of things which was anticipated by Lord Salisbury, and which is really quite indefensible—namely, that in the Moray Firth, over 2,000 square miles, and in the Firth of Clyde foreign trawlers can fish without interference, while British fishermen in the same areas are liable to fine or imprisonment with confiscation of their fishing tackle. For my part, I consider that no more unequal treatment could possibly be conceived, and I cannot for a moment imagine that such a state of things can be allowed to continue. It seems to me that the only course now open is for the Government to follow the line of the clause in the Act of 1895 and suspend the bye-laws of the Scottish Fishery Board pending agreement among the signatories of the North Sea Convention.

I do not propose to go at length into the question whether these bye-laws were originally justified. They, in fact, are not valid now as against foreign seamen, and it is therefore impossible that they can be maintained against British seamen. If it were necessary to enter into the question of the expediency of prohibiting trawling in such a branch of the sea as the Moray Firth, I should express my confident belief that there was no justification for the complaints against trawlers which led to the passing of these bye-laws—the complaints that they destroyed the spawn of fish in such areas and that they caught an undue quantity of immature fish. I was a member, together with the late Professor Huxley and the late Sir James Caird, of a Royal Commission which many years ago inquired into the subject, and we came to the conclusion that there was no justification whatever for any of these complaints. There is no scientific basis for the assertion that the great bulk of fish lay their spawn in such arms of the sea as the Moray Firth or the bays of Scotland. The only fish that spawns at the bottom of the sea in such waters is the herring. All the other more valuable fish spawn in the deep sea at various depths, and it is utterly impossible that the trawlers can do any mischief to them.

I would also venture to point out, if it were necessary, that during the years when the bye laws of the Scottish Fishery Board prevailed and there was no fishing on the part of foreign trawlers, there was no increase of fish and no good resulted to anybody. On the whole, therefore, it seems to me that the case against these bye-laws is absolutely complete. The question whether the fish in the North Sea are injured by over-trawling is being considered, and whatever action will be taken eventually will, no doubt, apply equally to the fishermen of all countries. That is a principle of the utmost importance. It is the principle which was affirmed in the strongest manner by Lord Salisbury in in the year 1895, and it seems to me that it is equally applicable at the present moment. I venture, therefore, to hope that the Government will act upon that principle, and will suspend the operation of the bye-laws of the Scottish Fishery Board as against British trawlers, at all events as long as there is no agreement on the part of other countries to apply them to their own trawlers.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I am obliged to leave the House rather earlier than usual, and I therefore ask permission to say a few words on my noble friend's Motion before Lord Balfour of Burleigh proceeds to move his Amendment. I should think no Member of the House will be found ready to take exception to what I understand to be the main position taken up by my noble friend Lord Heneage, when he protests strongly against the idea that we could accept, as a permanent settlement of this question, an arrangement under which British trawlers would be excluded from waters to which foreign trawlers are allowed free access. But, while that is a simple and, I think, an intelligible proposition, there are various other considerations, of which I think we should not lose sight.

This question is a particularly difficult and delicate one. The interests of the fishing industry are, to some extent, divergent; there are evidently two very distinct schools of thought—the school of the trawlers of Grimsby and Aberbeen, of which my noble friend is an able and energetic champion, and the school of the line fishermen. I do not think I am wrong in saying that the exasperation which is undoubtedly felt by the trawling industry is due, not so much to the value to them of the waters of the Moray Firth, as to the fact that their foreign competitors are allowed to visit those waters while they are excluded from them. The line fishermen, I think, must also have their champions, for I heard a very unmistakable cheer from the back benches when their interests were referred to by Lord Heneage in his opening speech. Not only are the problems that arise in connection with the fishing interests difficult, but questions of International law of the utmost delicacy and difficulty are also involved. My noble friend talked rather airily about the three-mile limit, and he proposes, in his Resolution, that "the open sea" should be restored to the condition in which it formerly existed.

LORD HENEAGE: Those are the words of Lord Tweedmouth.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: From whatever authority they proceed, I am bound to point out that it is not always very easy to determine where the open sea ends and territorial waters begin; and anyone who has had anything to do with these questions knows that there have been interminable negotiations upon the subject of the right of fishing within bays in different parts of the world, and that if you open the question as between this country and foreign countries in regard to a particular bay in which we are interested, they will desire to have it opened in regard to other bays and enclosed waters in other parts of the world. The Moray Firth is certainly not within territorial waters as we usually understand the term; it is not an enclosed bay. I do not know how many miles it covers from Duncansby Head to Rattray Head.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord FITZMAURICE): Nearly eighty miles.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The distance is, I am told, nearly eighty miles. Therefore we can hardly assume, as a matter of course, that other people will admit that it falls within our territorial waters. On the other hand, I am bound to say that a great deal would be gained, owing to the peculiar characteristics of the Moray Firth, if we could succeed in keeping all trawlers out of it and retaining it, partly as a sanctuary for breeding fish and partly in the interest of line fishermen. My noble friend Lord Heneage spoke of a small number of obsolete line fishing boats; but I have received a paper which purports to be written with authority, and which states that—

> "Around the shores of the Moray Firth there are located about 10,000 fishermen who fish with net and line; and in the winter months over 2,000 of these fisherman are engaged exclusively in white fishing in the Moray Firth."

Therefore we can hardly regard their interests as altogether negligible.

I understand that the policy of His Majesty's Government, and, I may say, to some extent the policy of Governments which have preceded them, has been that of endeavouring, in the first instance, to begin by excluding British trawlers from the Moray Firth in the hope that by so doing they would be able to bring about the exclusion of foreign trawlers also. That is, to my mind, a proper and intelligible policy; and so long as these local bye-laws are in force, there can be no doubt that it is the duty of British fishermen to conform to the law of their own country. Nor can we for a moment question the propriety of their conviction by Courts of law when they have been detected in the act of traversing the bye-laws. And I may add that, whatever my sympathy with the trawling fishermen may be, I certainly sympathise very little with those British fishermen who travesty themselves as foreigners, and invade these waters, from which legitimate British fishermen are excluded.

But, my Lords, I think my noble friend is perfectly right in arguing that, while such a state of things might be accepted as leading to something better, we cannot possibly look forward to its being indefinitely prolonged; and what I should like to know—and I hope we shall hear it before this debate concludes —is whether there is any prospect of His Majesty's Government taking up the matter, and endeavouring to come to an understanding with other Powers under which their vessels, as well as ours, would be denied access to the waters of the Firth. If that does not come to pass, then we shall be confronted with the position foreseen by Lord Salisbury in 1895, which he described in words that have been quoted by my noble friend at the Table (Lord Eversley), and which appear to me entirely appropriate to the case.

There is another point, of which, I think, we must not lose sight. I understand the attitude of His Majesty's Government to be this—they do not deny the grievance of British trawlers, but they hope to be able to effect the object of keeping foreign trawlers out by means of a Bill which has already been introduced into the House of Commons, and which may, or may not, in time come before your Lordships. I should, of course, be out of order if I were to canvass the merits of that Bill, but it is a matter of notoriety that it seeks, by indirect means, to drive foreign trawlers from the Moray Firth, by making their fish unsaleable in a British port. I will not attempt to examine the propriety of that proposal, or to discuss whether or not a measure of that kind is likely to be successful. But we must, I think, take into consideration the fact that that is the declared policy of His Majesty's Government, and that we shall, no doubt, at some future time have an opportunity of considering it as a whole. If that is so, shall we be altogether wise in passing the Resolution of my noble friend Lord Heneage ?

The Resolution involves two propositions, and, if my noble friend does not mind, I will take the second proposition first. He desires that any bye-laws now prohibiting vessels from fishing in the Moray Firth should be withdrawn. If I am right in supposing that there is likely to be a question of arriving at an understanding with foreign Powers on this matter, I can understand that His Majesty's Government should desire that in the meanwhile the bye-laws should remain in force, so that when their negotiations begin they will be able say, "We, at any rate, are in earnest; we are keeping our trawlers out of the Moray Firth, and we invite you to do the same." For that reason I should be reluctant peremptorily to call upon His Majesty's Government, in the words of the latter part of the Resolution, to annul or suspend the bye-laws. But the earlier portion of my noble friend's Resolution appears to me to be in principle perfectly defensible. He merely affirms the doctine of which, I think, we all approve, that British fishermen should not be excluded from waters to which foreign fishermen have free access. I can see no objection to that part of the Resolution, if my noble friend really thinks it worth while to divide the House upon it; but I am bound to say that such a Resolution seems to me somewhat of the character of a *brutum fulmen.* I do not know that it will greatly advance matters; and if he obtains, as I hope he will, a sympathetic reply from His Majesty's Government, if they are able to tell him that they cannot tolerate this inequality being indefinitely perpetuated and that they are determined to find means to put it to an end, then I would, with great respect, suggest to my noble friend that it might be a pity to divide the House, and thereby leave on the public mind the impression that there is amongst us a difference of opinion which I really believe does not exist.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH rose to move "The previous question." The noble Lord said: My Lords, I am sure no one will complain of the intervention of the noble Marquess who leads this side of the House. He has explained his reason for intervening early in the debate, and I am certain that, having regard to his great position in foreign affairs and his wide knowledge of the whole subject, his intervention was welcome to the House. I frankly associate myself with the main proposition put forward by the noble Marquess at the commencement of his speech. I certainly do not want to maintain anything in the nature of a real preference for foreigners. As a matter of fact, I have got into trouble at times because I am not convinced of the wisdom and practicability of a preference to people who cannot be described as foreigners. Under these circumstances I shall certainly not put myself forward as one who, either in principle or in practice, desires to maintain in any real sense a preference in British markets for those who are not British subjects.

I also associate myself very closely with what the noble Marquess said as regards the inexpediency of bringing forward this Motion at this particular time. I think it is quite contrary to the usual comity between the two Houses that when a Government Bill on a particular subject is before one House the other House should pass declamatory

Resolutions on the subject. Supposing a month or six weeks ago some Member of your Lordships' House had proposed an abstract Resolution on the subject of licensing. Surely it would have been almost unanimously condemned from both sides of this House, and it is because I desire to keep the matter open at any rate for the present, because I do not wish to meet the noble Lord's Motion with a direct negative for fear that I should be thought to be prejudging the case upon the other side, that I have taken what I think is the fairest and most proper course of putting down what is known in Parliamentary practice as an Amendment for the previous question. The noble Lord who seconded the Motion made great play with certain declarations which were made on the occasion of the Bill of 1885.

LORD EVERSLEY: 1895.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: It was in 1885, on the occasion of the Bill which allowed the closing of territorial waters, that Lord Salisbury made the remarks which the noble Lord quoted.

LORD EVERSLEY: I referred to what Lord Salisbury said in 1895, when the Scottish Sea Fisheries Bill of that year came before your Lordships' House.

LORD HENEAGE: The noble Lord is quite right. It was 1895.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I have not the reference here, but I am certain that one of the quotations made by the noble Lord was in the sense of a speech made by Lord Salisbury in 1885.

LORD EVERSLEY: I distinctly quoted the speech made in 1895.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: Will the noble Lord read again the words which he quoted from Lord Salisbury's speech in 1895?

LORD EVERSLEY: Certainly. Speaking of the Sea Fisheries Bill of 1895, Lord Salisbury said—

> "As the Bill stood, there was nothing to prevent a stretch of the sea being declared in which the foreigner might trawl and the Englishman might not. He could not conceive that that state of things could be endured. Would it be reasonable, if a trawler were sighted some eight miles from land and a Queen's ship were sent to stop him, that while the vessel was being brought in a French trawler should be allowed to come and take fish exactly on the tame ground with impunity? He felt sure here would be an outburst of extreme indignation if such a scandal were permitted."

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: Lord Salisbury made those remarks with regard to a proposal in the Bill of 1895 to extend the territorial limits all round the coast to thirteen miles, but that provision was altered in your Lordships' House. 1885 was the year in which the Act was passed closing the territorial waters. In that year the same sort of discussion took place as to closing waters which were beyond the territorial limit, and Lord Salisbury then used language which certainly gave the impression at the time that he was not in favour of that course or anything like it. But acts are stronger testimony than words, and it was Lord Salisbury's Government who in the year 1889 passed the Herring Fishery Act which gave permission to close the Moray Firth, the Firth of Clyde, and other waters of a similar kind. It was in 1890 that part of the Moray Firth was closed by Lord Salisbury's Government, and in 1892 the whole of the Firth was closed by the succeeding Government.

Matters were in that position when I came into office in 1895, the bye-law having been passed and the Moray Firth having been wholly closed. Both Governments, therefore, before the time I succeeded to office, were engaged in closing waters which were beyond the territorial limits. I had to administer the Act for eight years. I am in it, too, to a certain extent, for when on a purely technical point the Court of Session upset the bye-law I had it re-enacted in such a form as to avoid the technical difficulty which was then raised. One of the main points made by the mover and seconder of the Motion was this apparent hostility to foreign trawlers. They were perfectly fair in admitting that at the time when these bye-laws were made it was not supposed that foreigners would take much advantage of their supposed privileges, and I think before I have done I shall show your Lordships that even now the extent to which these much-dreaded foreigners are taking advantage of their supposed privileges has been greatly exaggerated.

I wish to say distinctly that those who were in favour of closing the area were mainly actuated by a desire to protect the stock of fish. The noble Lord who seconded the Motion referred to the inquiry in which he took part a good many years ago. I have no doubt that the decision at which they arrived at that time was justified by the evidence placed before them. But circumstances have largely changed. The efficiency of trawling machinery has now so much increased that it would be nothing short of a calamity if all legislation were to be undone, and trawlers given full scope in the narrowest waters. I will read to your Lordships, on that point, a passage from the evidence of Mr. Fulton before the Committee on Fishery Investigations which recently sat. Mr. Fulton said—

> "I know the Aberdeen men feel it as a grievance that the Moray Firth is closed, but I think that if it were effectively closed to every trawler they would not feel any grievance at all. I know positively, however, that some of them say that if they were admitted into the Moray Firth they could clear out the whole ground in six weeks."

That is the opinion of the immense majority of the fishing community who are acquainted with this ground. The testimony of all those who have knowledge of the subject amounts to this, that if trawling were wholly unrestricted, damage would be done to fishing grounds that would take years to repair.

Lord Heneage made great play with the apparent unanimity of the fishing community. At any rate, when action was taken in 1890 that community were not so unanimous as the noble Lord seems to think they are at the present time; and I am not quite sure that they are really as unanimous now as he would make out. A certain Mr. Barrett, of Grimsby, said at Aberdeen in 1905—

> "He did not believe the North Sea if left to itself would last for ever. He was one of those who thought it could not last very long."

Another gentleman from Grimsby, Mr. G. Alward, said on the same occasion—

> "His impression was that if they protected the young fish, and refrained from fishing for certain months in the year, he was sure, in his time, that the North Sea would become what it was twenty or thirty years ago—a splendid fishing ground—and that it would yield an enormous supply of food for the inhabitants of the country."

Another Grimsby gentleman, Mr. C. Jeffs, speaking at a Conference of the National Sea Fisheries Protection Association in London in 1902, said—

> "One is puzzled how it is that any gentleman can make such statements and hold such opinions that there is as much fish in the sea as there ever was."

The National Sea Fisheries Association asked the Fishery Board of Scotland in 1890 to inquire as to the wisdom of closing a large part of the Moray Firth, so that it may actually be said that it was partly on the initiative of the very association which is now most severe on the Fishery Board of Scotland that the action of 1892 was taken.

The noble Lord made light of the interests of the fishing community around the Moray Firth. I am really opposed to protection, in the sense in which the word is generally used, for anybody, but we hear a great deal now about the necessity of getting people back to the land. It is beyond all doubt that this quasi-protection has been largely instrumental in keeping people upon the sea coast around the Moray Firth, on the Clyde, and elsewhere. The tendency among those who live by fishing is to have larger and larger boats, and, as you have larger boats, you must go to larger harbours, which are only to be found in more or less crowded communities. And it seems to me a perfectly wise and reasonable bit of public policy to keep the territorial waters for those fishermen who have not the capital or the ability to go outside to the deep sea fishing. I do not believe that the closing of these waters does any material injury to the trawlers. I believe their demand to be largely due to selfishness on their part, and that upon the whole it is wise to preserve these districts for the class of fishermen to whom I have referred.

They are still a class of some magnitude. The noble Lord made light of them, but in a circular letter which reached me about three days ago, from the office of the Central Secretary of the Moray Firth Fisheries Association I find this statement—

> "The Fishery Board took into account the fact that around the shores of the Moray Firth there are located about 10,000 fishermen who fish with net and line. In the winter months over 2,000 of these fishermen are engaged exclusively in the white fishing in the Moray Firth."

It seems to me of great importance that there should be near their homes this area in which they can carry on their livelihood uninterrupted by the damage to their tackle which trawling in narrow waters undoubtedly does.

Now I come to another part of the subject. Is it really the case that a large number of foreign trawlers take advantage of the present state of things? There have been some, and there are some at the present time, but in quantity they are negligible. The great majority of those trawlers which are breaking the law are only colourably foreign. Mr. Fulton, in his evidence before the Committee on Fishery Investigations, 1908, was asked by Mr. Green [Question 2895]—

> "I want to know how the companies owning these boats which are registered in Norway are registered in England?"

Mr. Fulton replied—

> "I am not acquainted with the details, but I heard a leading representative—Sir George Doughty, I think it was—say at Aberdeen that all the capital invested in these vessels, except a few pounds, was English."

If we are to go back on the policy of the last sixteen years with regard to the Moray Firth, let us know the facts. Let us have an inquiry to ascertain exactly how many *bona fide* foreigners are trawling in these enclosed waters. I believe it will be found that they are very few in number. And, in my opinion, it is beyond all doubt that those who come are invited by the trawling interest for the purpose of casting discredit upon this bye-law.

I can give your Lordships some facts. I was at the Scottish Office in 1895–6 when this controversy began. The first foreign vessel to trawl in the Firth was the "Dania," of Esbjerg, and the first report of her appearance was received from the Secretary of the Bon Accord Steam Trawlowners' Association in Aberdeen. We were told by this association, which was hostile to the bye-law, a good many hours before this foreign vessel appeared that she was coming to do what she did. It was what is commonly called a "try on," and I think it requires some explanation how this intelligent anticipation of events about to occur really happened. If we are going into this matter thoroughly, let us know exactly who the people are who are trawling in the Moray Firth at the present time, how many of them are really foreigners and how many sham foreigners, how many of them are actually working with English money, and how many of them are really the Grimsby people who, under different names, are sending trawlers all over the North Sea. I believe that if we could get at the truth we would find that the *bona fide* foreigner was a negligible quantity compared with the others.

When a great country like this decides to try an experiment for the sake of putting to a practical test the question whether this system of fishing deteriorates stock, I say it is very hard—I say more, it is unpatriotic—that we should be constantly thwarted by the selfishness of those who have their own interests to serve. The experiment has never yet been fairly tried, because from first to last the trawl-owners have set themselves to thwart it. Let us have a full examination into all the facts. Let us try the experiment, and if we are wrong let us go back upon our policy. But do not let us go back upon insufficient evidence. Let us be quite sure that we are right before we make the change. I think there is gross exaggeration with regard to numbers, and that the appearance of *bona fide* foreign trawlers is only occasional.

I would venture to say one word in conclusion upon the terms of the Motion on the Paper. The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, seemed to think that it would do no harm, or practically little harm, to place the first half of it upon the Journals of the House. But let me call attention to the phraseology. The first part of the Resolution reads—

> "That in the opinion of this House British vessels should not be prohibited from trawling in waters outside the territorial limits of Scotland where foreign vessels are able to come in and use the fishing ground."

Now, if it were proved that foreign vessels in the strict sense of the term do come in and use the fishing ground, I should be prepared to modify a good deal of my opposition. But my noble friend does not ask the House to commit itself to stating that they do come in, but only that they are able to come in.

LORD HENEAGE: I am quite willing to alter the words if the noble Lord wishes, but I preferred to use Lord Salisbury's words.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I can understand the desire of the noble Lord to shelter himself under Lord Salisbury's great authority, but it is not said in the Resolution that they are Lord Salisbury's words, and if it should appear in the Journals of the House there will not be a marginal note to the effect that the noble Lord borrowed the words from Lord Salisbury. They will be taken in their natural sense, and I say it is ludicrous to ask this House to pass a Resolution when all that is proposed to be said is that a certain class of vessels are able to come in. Prove to us that *bona fide* foreigners do come in in such numbers as to make our regulation bad, and I will modify my opposition. There was a good deal in the noble Lord's speech about the Scottish Office and its character with which I prefer not to deal. I suppose that what he said will pass for wit at Grimsby, or, perhaps, at Billingsgate, but it was no serious argument in regard to the matter before the House, and therefore I think I shall be best consulting my own interests and the interests of the House if I now move the Amendment which stands in my name.

Amendment moved, "That the previous Question be put whether the said Question shall be now put."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*LORD FITZMAURICE: My Lords, I had occasion about a year ago to address your Lordships, I am afraid at rather too great length, on the very intricate questions which have arisen in connection with the North Sea Fisheries and their bearing on foreigners and foreign vessels. It was necessary then that I should place upon record, once and for all, in regard to this question, that there was no occasion whatever to doubt that the Foreign Office were committed, and irrevocably committed, on grounds of public policy which I stated to the House, and that they stood in regard to territorial waters upon the doctrine of the three-mile limit as what I may call the great underlying principle of international law.

That question has again been incidentally touched upon this evening, and I understand that one of the objects of the noble Lord the mover of this Motion is to obtain an assertion from the representative of the Foreign Office in your Lordships' House that there is no change of attitude in respect of this matter. That assurance I have no difficulty whatever in giving my noble friend. Nor do I really think that it was necessary to ask for it, because nothing has occurred since last year, so far as I know, to lead anyone to think for a single moment that there is any derogation from that principle. There is, of course, a slight qualification which one always has to make in regard to the three-mile limit, which was alluded to by my noble friend Lord Lansdowne. As Lord Salisbury's name has been so frequently invoked, I cannot do better than quote his words in the debate of 6th May, 1895, in regard to the three-mile limit and to those particular places where what may be called the facts of nature have made difficulties in applying that hard and fast principle and caused some slight modification in practice. Lord Salisbury said—

> "As long as the coast is open there is no doubt that three miles is the limit of territorial waters, but when the coast is folded and doubled, as it is in that part of Scotland, there comes in a different set of conditions which belong to diplomatic law; and I may say it is an unsettled question in international law how far those territorial waters extend in such cases. . . . Where the coast is not straight but makes an angle, there the limit of the territorial waters is not so fixed."

It is precisely because many of the waters on the coast of Scotland are folded in that many of these difficulties arise.

There has always been a natural tendency on the part of different countries, by treaty if they can, by legislation if diplomacy fails, to obtain a certain amount of special control outside the narrow limits imposed by the three-mile rule. It is a rash thing to intrude into the minutiæ of a Scottish debate unless one is conversant with the actual places oneself. It is not, therefore, for me to try and give any accurate description from the point of view of the geographer. But we know that just as the limits of the North Sea have, for certain purposes, been defined by the North Sea Convention and by other, and, perhaps, more recent documents, so also by British legislation for domestic purposes a certain area has been defined to represent the Moray Firth. That area extends from Rattray Head to Duncansby Head, a distance of very nearly 80 miles; and this area is very different from the narrow waters which make up the Firth of Clyde and other areas on the coast of Scotland where the waters are far more folded in. The Moray Firth, as now defined, gradually opens out and extends, and the large definition which has been made by the bye-law issued by the Scottish Office is no doubt one of the causes, perhaps the primary cause, of the irritation which has been created. amongst the allies of my noble friend at Grimsby and elsewhere.

But I think your Lordships will agree that in this affair we must, above all things, be practical. We are in the clutches of previous legislation, and we cannot go back upon the decision of Parliament, for which both parties are responsible, by passing abstract resolutions. No one disputes that there are difficulties in the existing state of things. There I am on common ground with my noble friend. It is common knowledge that a Bill has been brought in in another place, and this fact may be accepted as a statement on behalf of His Majesty's Government that we realise the difficulties of the situation. The real difficulty has been so often stated in the course of this debate that it is not necessary to labour it. Briefly stated it is this, that British fishermen and foreigners are not on terms of equality in certain extra-territorial waters; and the question which is really before your Lordships to-night is, What is to be the rule and practice in regard to extra-territorial waters on the coast of Scotland and England? The Bill which has been brought in by the Scottish Office in another place, and which may reach your Lordships in the course of the present session, is a measure which affects the coasts, harbours, and ports of England in respect mainly of the sale of fish caught in the extra-territorial waters, bringing them under practically the same rule and practice which now applies under Scottish legislation to the ports, harbours, and markets of Scotland. It is that to which my noble friend objects.

The question is, what course could the Government adopt? We start by admitting that there is an inequality at the present time, that in certain extra-territorial waters British fishermen are placed at a disadvantage compared with foreign fishermen because they come within the scope of British and Scottish legislation, which applies to them and does not apply to the foreign trawler. My noble friend is, of course, cognisant that if the legislation now proposed by the Government were to come into effect, certain disabilities which now affect only the fishermen who bring their catches into Scottish ports would be extended to those fishermen if they brought them into British ports. At the same time, I must remind my noble friend that the disability which would in that case be extended to the British fisherman is one which, in the particular matter of sale—as is now the case in Scottish ports—would also affect the foreigner. The moment a fisherman is in British harbours and markets he is either within the territorial waters or is actually on shore; and, therefore, the Bill so far places the foreigner and the Scottish or English fisherman, as the case may be, upon an equality. I am perfectly willing to grant that that, however, is only a step in the direction which my noble friend desires to go, and is not precisely the step which he does desire. What he desires is not to penalise the foreign fisherman and the British fisherman equally in Scottish or English ports. He desires to sweep away the bye-law which affects extra-territorial waters, and thereby to place the British and Scottish fisherman on an equality in those waters with the foreigner as he was before the legislation of 1885, 1889, and 1895.

I have been pressed by my noble friend and also by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition to state to your Lordships whether there is, or is not, in the opinion of the Foreign Office, any chance, or whether there is any intention on their part, of curing the difficulty which we admit to exist by ultimately obtaining some remedy more akin to the views of my noble friend than are the proposals in the Government Bill now before Parliament. I desire to be perfectly frank in this matter. I am not able to make any statement to your Lordships that there is an immediate probability of our being able to persuade foreign Governments collectively, because collective action in this matter is almost necessary, or even to persuade the more important among them to come into an agreement with us in the matter, such as was undoubtedly contemplated by the late Lord Salisbury when he moved and carried the Amendment in 1895 to which allusion has been made in the course of this debate. My noble friend, Lord Tweedmouth, whose absence we all regret, pointed out at that time that the carrying of Lord Salisbury's Amendment would, in his opinion, make the Act of 1895 entirely inoperative. What Lord Tweedmouth then said has been perfectly justified by the result, because whatever attempts have been made in the twelve years that have elapsed to obtain an agreement amongst the Powers they have never proceeded to any length or been successful.

We have always been confronted with the difficulty, that as there were so many waters elsewhere to which English fishermen now go and from which they would be likely to be excluded, it would be an exceedingly doubtful benefit to the English fishing industry if we were successful in the negotiations contemplated, and therefore the matter is one to be dealt with with the most extreme care and circumspection. On the coasts of Norway and Iceland are waters in connection with which there are ancient controversies, and if we were to press our own views too much in regard to, let us say, the Moray Firth, the result might much astonish the very persons who are pressing the Foreign Office to move in the direction referred to. It is for that reason that the Government have so far thought it wiser to proceed on the lines of existing legislation, and to try to place the foreigner and the English and Scottish trawling industry upon a footing of equality by placing them equally under such disabilities as they can enforce in their own ports, harbours and territorial waters, rather than to trust to long, and, perhaps, futile negotiations in regard to extra-territorial waters, which would affect, in the long run, not only the extra-territorial waters near our shores, but those in the neighbourhood of other countries where the British fishing industry has large interests.

Whatever risks there may be in the future, it certainly would appear that, so far, the number of genuine foreign fishermen who have come into the Moray Firth and pursued their industry there is not very considerable, and the Government think it better to trust to the class of remedy which exists in the Scottish Acts and to propose their extension to certain of our English ports. This is a complicated matter; the facts are complicated because they are disputed, and the law is also complicated. I can only hope that your Lordships will at least be persuaded, by what I have placed before you this evening, that the Foreign Office and the Government generally are fully cognisant of the general interests involved in the question, and that my noble friend in particular will accept my assurance that the interests of British fishermen are near and dear to the Office which is more particularly responsible for them, and that, so far as the Foreign Office is concerned, there is no intention whatever of departing from those great principles of international law which I had the honour to lay before your Lordships last year.

*LORD SALTOUN: My Lords, I do not propose to detain your Lordships for more than a few moments, but I should like to point out that there is no doubt that trawling has very greatly depleted the North Sea. This has been practically admitted by a great number of gentlemen interested in trawling. Lord Balfour has already quoted the opinions of two or three of them and I will not, therefore, trouble your Lordships on that point. But I should like to refer your Lordships to the fishery statistics of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries in proof of the assertion that trawling is doing a great deal of harm to the shallow waters of the North Sea. For instance, there were one million cwts. less fish trawled in the North Sea in 1905 than in 1903. The waters of the Moray Firth are shallower still, and contain very valuable breeding ground which will be very soon destroyed if trawlers are allowed to go there. Mr. Sutherland, the Member for Elgin Burghs, stated in the House of Commons, on July 8th last, that the present trawling fleet are equal to over 12,000 of the old fishing smacks. The hon. Member proceeded to quote an article from a Scottish newspaper, in which the writer said it was calculated that the spread of nets or the width of sea bottom covered extended at least to twenty-five miles, and that with a net towed at a speed of three miles per hour for twenty working hours per day the area daily swept by them amounted to 1,500 square miles. He added—

> "The whole of the Moray Firth would thus be swept from shore to shore in a day and a half."

I live on the shores of Moray Firth, and believe that the few so-called foreign trawlers which come there are really owned by Englishmen, the capital being found by Englishmen, and that they fly a foreign flag in order to evade the law of this country, with the ultimate object of securing bigger dividends. Mr. Sutherland, in the speech to which I have referred, declared that the attempt on the part of Grimsby trawl owners to defeat the law was a—

> "cold-blooded, merciless, squalid conspiracy, a conspiracy intended not for purposes of patriotism, but in order to secure bigger dividends."

I confess that I do not think that language too strong. A conference was held in Aberdeen in 1905, and the Commissioner of the Norwegian Fisheries attended with the intention of stating that his Government were anxious to co-operate with His Majesty's Government in stopping the registration of Grimsby trawlers under the Norwegian flag. For some reason or other, he was not able to make this statement, but he wrote a letter to that effect to the fishing trade journal, which shows that the Norwegian Government, at all events, are anxious to co-operate, if possible, with His Majesty's Government. Personally, I think the way out of the difficulty is to reopen the conference of 1882, and to try to come to an arrangement with the other Powers for the closing of the Moray Firth to all countries. If for some reason unknown to us laymen the Foreign Office are unable to do this, then I ask your Lordships to accept the Amendment moved by Lord Balfour of Burleigh and leave the Moray Firth as it is at present.

THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I should like to say one word in support of what has been said as to the damage done to line-fishing by trawlers. It is within my knowledge that in the past the line fishermen have suffered great hardship at the hands of trawlers. The latter represent the capitalists, and have behind them all the strength and influence which money can give; whereas the line fishermen are poor men, and unless they are protected from what I must call unfair competition, they will soon find their livelihood entirely gone. There is no doubt room for both line fishermen and trawlers to work in the North Sea, but it is impossible for them to work in the same areas. I would point out to your Lordships that there are 33,000 line fishermen in Scotland, and only 2,900 trawlers. I object to regarding trawlers as martyrs, simply because they are not allowed by the regulations to enter certain prescribed areas and curtail the supply of fish to the community by destroying the spawning beds and catching large quantities of immature fish. I know many villages on the coast of Aberdeenshire which were once inhabited by prosperous communities, and which are now half-empty simply because fishing inshore has been destroyed by trawlers. I have three of these villages on my own property, and I know how exceptionally hard this has pressed upon the old people in those villages. I have often seen, from my own windows on the Aberdeen coast, these trawlers lying at dusk just outside the three-mile limit, and the line fishermen tell me that the moment it gets dark the trawlers come in and sweep all the beds clean. I therefore think it most necessary that stringent regulations should be imposed. The reasons which influenced the Fishery Board to include the Moray Firth were, first, that there were important spawning beds requiring protection; and, secondly, that the Moray Firth had been proved to be a very valuable nursery for young fish. I quite admit that trawling is a legitimate trade, but it should not be carried on at the expense of the community. In the Report of the Fishery Board it is stated that to those engaged in the industry the growing increase in the quantity of small haddocks landed is a matter of concern, and that the small mesh nets now used by the majority of trawlers are responsible for this. These small fish, we are told, are frequently sold for manure. I think that nobody can contend that these trawlers do no harm to the fish supply. The trawlers have no right to kill the goose that lays the golden egg, and, for these reasons, if the noble Lord, Lord Heneage, goes to a division, I shall certainly vote against him.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords I do not intend to trouble your Lordships with any observations upon this matter. There appears to be a general consensus of opinion that British fishermen ought not to be placed in a position of disability as compared with foreign fishermen. That is a general proposition, and as far as the terms of the present law are concerned they do not appear to be entirely consistent with that proposition; but, in matters of this great delicacy, it is evident that a general proposition of that kind can only be applied with due regard to the magnitude of the evil or mischief which it is intended to concern. I gather that nearly every speaker has agreed that the number of foreign trawlers who take advantage of their position to use the Moray Firth is exceedingly small. My noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh most frankly confessed that if there were a large number he might take a different view; and the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy founded a good deal of his argument upon the fact that the number of foreign trawlers was very small. My noble friend, Lord Saltoun, speaking from personal knowledge of the actual locality, also gave the same testimony. In these circumstances, I only rise for the purpose of suggesting to my noble friend, Lord Heneage, that the words which fell from my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition, indicate the proper line on the present occasion, and that it is not worth while to assert a general proposition which nobody desires to contest. I therefore hope my noble friend will not press his Motion; and, if he takes that view, no doubt my noble friend, Lord Balfour, will withdraw his Amendment and thus open the way for the withdrawal of the Motion.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, the course which was suggested by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition appears to me to be the better one. I shall, therefore, adopt it. At the same time, I desire to say that I adhere to everything I have said with regard to the *bona fides* of the foreign vessels that are at present fishing in these waters; and, although I have not had time to verify it, I have received information from Fleetwood that five more *bona fide* German vessels have come to Fleetwood to fish from there. I am quite willing, if Lord Balfour of Burleigh will withdraw his Amendment, to withdraw my Motion and content myself with the discussion which has taken place.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, in order to make way for my noble friend to withdraw his Motion I am quite willing to withdraw my Amendment. But while I am not going to be provoked into making another speech in reply to what the noble Lord has just said, I wish to say that in agreeing to the withdrawal of the Amendment, I do not agree with the speech which the noble Lord has made in conveying his request.

Amendment for putting the previous Question (by leave of the House) withdrawn; then the original Motion (by leave of the House) withdrawn.

THE DECORATION FOR NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to ask his Majesty's Government whether they could furnish any information in respect to the conditions or regulations which it was proposed to institute in connection with the new decoration for officers of the Royal Naval Reserve and of the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, and a long service and good conduct medal for men of the Royal Naval Reserve and the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve. The noble Lord said: My Lords, before asking the Question which stands in my name, I would like to express the gratification it have me to learn that His Majesty, on the recommendation of the President of the Board of Trade, had approved of the grant of a clasp in connection with the medal which His Majesty awards for gallantry in saving life at sea, this clasp to be granted to any person to whom the medal has already been awarded in recognition of a similar service performed subsequently to that for which the medal was granted. I am sure that we all admire the heroic deeds which are so frequent in the mercantile marine of this country, and we must feel great satisfaction at the personal interest in this matter which is displayed by His Majesty.

I should like to bring to your Lordships' notice what happened not very long ago. The captain and officers of a British steamer rendered very valuable service in rescuing a portion of the crew of a Greek ship. His Majesty the King of Greece, as a mark of his high admiration of the bravery and humanity displayed, signed a decree at Athens, conferring upon the captain and chief officer the gold decoration of the Order of the Redeemer, and on the second, third, and fourth officers the silver decoration of the same Order. The Board of Trade apparently took exception to this, and through the Foreign Office informed the Greek Government that such high awards were not usual, and might be a source of dissatisfaction in future cases where services of the kind were rendered. The Greek Government then substituted silver medals, which the captain and two of the officers have courteously but firmly declined to accept. My Lords, I think this was a most uncalled-for action on the part of the Board of Trade, besides being a most ungracious one towards the foreign potentate who had been pleased to recognise the bravery of the captain and his officers in such a gracious way. Has there ever been a case of any foreign Power interfering to prevent her subjects receiving honours from another nation in recognition of valuable service rendered ?

In respect to my Question I should like to say that the Admiralty have, in my humble opinion, taken a wise and proper step in instituting the decoration and medals to which my Question refers. I only wish that something of the kind could be extended to the whole merchant service, for, after all, it is essentially a national service, and one upon which our Empire mainly depends. At the present time my suggestion, may, perhaps, be considered too progressive. However, it is some satisfaction to feel that at least a start has been made ; that our merchant commanders, officers, and seamen are beginning to be recognised as they should be, and that the enormous importance of the service which they represent is becoming more and more adequately realised.

I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

THE EARL OF GRANARD : My Lords, I am glad of the opportunity afforded by the noble Lord's Question to state on behalf of the Admiralty that the King has been graciously pleased to approve of the institution of a long service and good conduct medal for the two principal branches of the Volunteer Naval Reserve—namely, the old-established Royal Naval Reserve, which is composed of persons belonging to the merchant service and the fishing community of this country ; and, secondly, the Royal Naval Volunteers established five years ago by Lord Selborne's Board, acting on the report of a committee presided over by my right hon. friend the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. His Majesty has approved of a new medal being designed and struck for the purpose, and has selected a design displaying on the obverse of the medal the effigy of His Majesty in naval uniform, and on the reverse a representation of H.M.S. "Dreadnought." The King has also approved of the institution of a decoration for officers for both the branches of the Naval Reserve, and this is somewhat similar in appearance to the existing Territorial Army decoration. The detailed rules which will govern the grant of both the decoration and the medal are now being framed, and until official sanction has been given to the regulations which it is intended to adopt, it is not possible for me to make any statement with regard to them on behalf of the Board of Admiralty.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow at half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 11th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

IMPORTATION OF PLUMAGE PROHIBITION BILL.

Petition from Wick and Pulteneytown, against ; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions from Shaftesbury and other places, against ; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Ashton under Lyne, in favour ; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CRIMES (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto, [ordered 2nd November; *Mr. Lonsdale*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 320.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4164 and 4165 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (TRADE).

Copy presented, of Review of the Trade of India for 1907–8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DOCK LABOUR IN RELATION TO POOR LAW RELIEF.

Copy presented, of Report to the President of the Local Government Board by the Honourable Gerald Walsh, one of the Inspectors of the Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WESTERN PACIFIC.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Administration of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FISCAL POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

Copy ordered, "of Memorandum by Mr. Alfred Marshall on the Fiscal Policy of International Trade."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 321.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Compensation for Licences Withdrawn.

MR. WHITBREAD (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the case of licences for which compensation has been awarded by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue under the Licensing Act, 1904, since the date of 1st August, 1906, he can give the total amount so awarded, the total of the Schedule A assessments of the houses in question, and the estimated value of the same houses after the extinction of the licences.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Since 1st August, 1906, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have determined awards of compensation to an aggregate amount of £671,795, in the case of 742 houses. The total of the Schedule A assessments of these houses when licensed was £29,258, and their total annual value unlicensed was £14,742, as estimated by the Inland Revenue for compensation purposes, that is to say, the estimated annual value of the houses unlicensed amounted to about 50 per cent. of their Schedule A value with licences. These figures may be compared with those given in reply to a previous Question as the houses in respect of which the Commissioners awarded compensation for the years 1905 and 1906, showing (exclusive of premises which have been unoccupied) a total Schedule A assessment, with licences, of £20,145, and an actual Schedule A assessment, without licences, of £14,442, or about 72 per cent. of the value with licences.

Scale of Living at Twickenham.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now in a position to say what is the cost of living in the postal area of Twickenham.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is estimated by analogy from neighbouring towns where investigation has been made by the Board of Trade that the cost of living at Twickenham is considerably above the normal. Under this analogy the scales of pay of the indoor and outdoor force at Twickenham have been raised.

Hours in Provincial Post Offices.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state what are the recognised weekly hours of the clerical staff in the head offices of Worksop, Mansfield, Lincoln, Spilsby, Gainsborough, Grimsby, and Brigg; and what are the weekly hours these staffs have worked during the past twelve months.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will have inquiry made into the matter, and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Expedition of Mails to Ross, Co. Cavan.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, having regard to the fact that letters posted in Belfast at 7.30 p.m. are not delivered at Ross sub-post office, near Mount Nugent, County Cavan, till the second day following, and that it takes the same time for a letter from Ross to be delivered in County Monaghan, he can see his way to have the delivery of these mails expedited.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is only one post a day to and from Ross, and it would not be practicable to expedite the delivery of the mails referred to, except by instituting a second post. As there is a loss to revenue on the existing service I should not, I am sorry to say, be justified in authorising an additional service.

Women Inspectors of the Board of Education.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education how many women inspectors are now employed by the Board of Education; how many are on the permanent staff, and how many temporarily employed; what are the maximum salaries (and allowances) attached to such posts; what are the maximum salaries obtainable, and by what increments are these reached; and whether an increase of the number of women inspectors is contemplated by the board.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) There are now twenty-one women inspectorships on the staff of the Board of Education; of these all but three are on the permanent staff, with salaries of £200 rising by increments of £15 to £400, as shown in the Estimates; the other three being tenable for five years at a fixed annual salary of £300. Besides these there is the post of chief woman inspector, and further, women not on the board's staff are sometimes employed for two or three consecutive days on different occasions for assisting in the full inspection of secondary schools, being paid by fees proportionate to the time so spent. The answer to the concluding paragraph is in the affirmative.

1-Pounder Quick Firing Guns.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state how many 1-pounder quick-firing guns for field service the British Army possesses per 1,000 men, as compared with the French and German armies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The hon. and gallant Member appears to be under some misapprehension. 1-pounder quick-firing guns have been withdrawn from the British service, and there are no such guns in either the French or German armies.

Appointment of Governor for the Island of Trinidad.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a governor has yet been appointed for the Island of Trinidad; and, if not, when this appointment is likely to be made.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) The vacant Governorship of Trinidad has not yet been filled, but the Secretary of State hopes that the appointment will be made very shortly.

Precautions against Anthrax.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will give instructions to the consuls in the ports from which goats' hair, mohair, and low quality of wools are exported to circulate amongst the farmers, dealers, and packers in their respective districts a request that they will use every possible precaution to prevent blood stains and pieces of skin being sent to this country in bales for manufacturing purposes, as according to the recent discovery by Dr. Enrich, of Bradford, that the germs of anthrax are traceable to blood stains and not to the ordinary dust arising from the sorting of foreign materials, the fatal cases arising from anthrax may be diminished, and the costly regulations for dealing with ordinary dust may, if thought advisable, be considerably modified.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I am advised by the Secretary of State for the Home Department that the issue of such a request as is suggested in the Question might possibly prove useful though too great expectations must not be based upon it, and that, after consultation with the Home Office, steps will be taken to bring the suggestion to the notice of those interested.

Baskets for Irish Postal Services.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that samples of baskets required for the Post Office have to be sent to an English depot, he will arrange that a receiving depot will be established in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) This has already been arranged; practically all the baskets required for the Irish parcel service will be ordered in Ireland and delivered in Dublin.

Registration of Ownership of Lands.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he will consider the advisability of recommending an Amendment to the reference to the Royal Commission at present taking evidence on the working of the Land Transfer Acts, to enable them to take evidence in favour of the establishment in every county of local registries of deeds similar to the registries that have for the last two centuries existed in the counties of Middlesex and Yorkshire.

(*Answered by Sir William Robson.*) It is not intended to change the reference to the Royal Commission, nor am I prepared to say that they are excluded by its terms from considering the question of local registries of deeds.

The Crown and the Prerogative of Mercy.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department on what grounds does he maintain that it is out of his power, having regard to the provisions of the Prisons Act of 1898, to remove prisoners from the second to the first division, having regard that by that Act the prerogative of mercy exercised by the Crown on his advice is not affected.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have not contended, and I do not contend, that there is an absolute legal obstacle to the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, in a particular case and for exceptional reasons, so as to effect the transfer of a prisoner from the second to the first division as an act of clemency by means of a conditional pardon. The prerogative of mercy, as such, is not altered by the Act of 1898. That Act, however, very widely extended the discretion of courts as regards prison treatment. Parliament established three divisions in local prisons, the second division being designed to enable prisoners of respectable character and antecedents to be completely separated from prisoners belonging to the criminal classes, and in express terms it entrusted to the Courts the discretion of placing each prisoner in one or other of the three divisions. In these circumstances it appears to me that to use the prerogative of mercy for the purpose of overriding the discretion given by law to the Court of trial, and deliberately exercised, would be wrong and unconstitutional action by the Government. Even though the prerogative might be exercised for special reasons as an act of clemency in an individual case, this clearly could not be done for the purpose of placing a whole class of prisoners in a privileged position. I may add that, with regard to the ladies who are now detained in Holloway Prison for offences against the ordinary law, I see no reason to think that the magistrates have exercised their discretion otherwise than rightly in directing that they shall be treated in the second division.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether seven ladies, imprisoned for offences arising out of the woman suffrage agitation who were placed in the third division by the magistrate, have been removed by his authority from the third to the second division; and will he explain how it is within his discretion to exercise the power of removing prisoners from the third to the second division, but outside his discretion to remove prisoners from the second to the first division.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Eleven ladies were removed from the third to the second division, but this was done by the magistrate, not by me. All I did was to draw the attention of the magistrate to the fact that these ladies belonged to the class of prisoners for whom the second division was intended. I have no executive power to remove prisoners from one division to another; and, as regards the seven ladies who are still detained in default of paying their fines, I do not propose to take any steps with a view to their being removed from the second division to the first.

Civil Service Supply Association.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Civil Service Supply Association, of Queen Victoria Street, is a business organised an conducted by State-paid Civil servants; and whether this association is permitted to canvass and solicit orders from Government employees during office hours.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The association is, I understand, managed by a committee about half of whom are Civil servants and the rest retired Civil servants. The Answer to the latter part of the Question is in the negative; but, I believe, objection is not in practice raised to a servant of the association calling to take any orders that members of Government departments may have to give him.

Pension Officer for Bryansford, Co. Down.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a pension officer has yet been appointed for the Bryansford, County Down, sub-district; and, if not, when will the appointment be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) A pension officer has been appointed for the locality to which the hon. Member refers.

Licence-holders Brewing own Beer.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the number of licensed holders who brew and sell their own beer; and how many barrels did they pay duty upon during the last-known financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The number of licensed holders in England and Wales who brew and sell their own beer is given on page 6 of the last Brewers Licences Return (*i.e.*, for the year ending 30th September, 1907, Parliamentary Paper, No. 32, of 1908) as follows:—Victuallers, 2,065; retailers of beer "on" 1,103; retailers of beer "off," 88. In addition, a certain number of the 1,503 common brewers shown on the same page have a victualler's or retailer's business subsidiary to the main business of a brewer, but I have no means of determining how many. I have no information as to the number of barrels on which duty was paid by such licensed holders.

Brewers Paying Duty on less than 500 Barrels.

MR. BARNARD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if he will state how many licensed brewers paid duty on less than 500 barrels during the last-known year.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have no information as to the number of brewers paying duty on less than 500 barrels.

Home Produce of Hops.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what was the amount of home-produce of hops during the year 1907–8; what was the average annual home-production of hops during the last five years; how does this amount compare with that for the earliest quinquennium for which similar reliable figures are obtainable; and what was the average acreage under hops in England in the first and last quinquennium, respectively.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The English crop of hops was 374,129 cwts. in 1907, and 470,761 cwts. in 1908. The annual average home production in the last five years (1904–8) was 413,770 cwts., and in the five years 1885–9 504,386 cwts. The average acreage under hops in England in 1885–9 was 64,276 acres, and in 1904–8 45,469 acres.

Old Age Pensions Claim.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that instructions to pensions officers require that cases in which the officer and the supervisor differ as to a claimant's right to a pension, or in which, owing to special circumstances, the officer and the supervisor are unable to come to a decision, shall be reported to the Board of Inland Revenue for directions before the claim is submitted to a pension committee; whether it is claimed that these regulations were made by the Board of Inland Revenue by virtue of No. 34 of the Treasury Regulations; and whether, seeing that that paragraph only authorised orders, instructions, and directions of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, subject to the provisions of the Act and of these regulations, while the control assumed by the Board of Inland Revenue in the matter is not subject to, but in contravention of the provisions of the Act and the Treasury regulations, he will direct it to be withdrawn.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have had before me the confidential instructions to pension officers which have been given by the Board of Inland Revenue, and I am satisfied that the directions which have been given as to the manner in which claims are to be dealt with are in full accordance with the provisions of the Act and the regulations.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, seeing that the regulations issued by the Board of Inland Revenue to old-age pension officers have no validity beyond the fact that they are instructions to officers, and that the Board of Inland Revenue's regulations that the supervisor must initial all reports of the pension officer before they are sent to the pension committee can be no possible check on the truthfulness of the evidence or the accuracy of the officer's report, because the supervisor has no knowledge of either, and is, therefore, no safeguard against fraud on either the claimants or the Treasury, he will direct this regulation to be withdrawn and the procedure of the Act and of the Treasury regulations to be carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The duties of the supervisor in connection with claims are performed by him in his capacity of pension officer for the district in which he has been appointed by the Treasury to act, in accordance with the provisions of Section 8 (4) of the Act and No. 34 of the Regulations. The present procedure is, in my judgment, necessary for the efficient administration of the Act, and does not appear to me to be in any way inconsistent with anything contained either in the Act or in the Regulations.

Old-Age Pensions in Ireland.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether, since the Local Government Board for Ireland has been constituted by the Old-Age Pensions Act the central pension authority in Ireland and the local pension committee have been made the tribunal (subject to the Local Government Board) for determining the merit of claims, he can state by what authority the Board of Inland Revenue has usurped these powers of the Local Government Board and the local committees in certain cases and taken into the hands of the Somerset House staff the decision of claims on which its officers differ before the local pension committee is allowed to have information of the claim at all.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Board of Inland Revenue has no power to "decide" any claim to an old-age pension, nor am I aware of any case in which they have claimed to exercise such a power.

Old-Age Pensions in the Channel Islands.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consider the advisability of extending the benefits of the Old-Age Pensions Act to naval and military pensioners resident in the Channel Islands, considering that a great part of their lives has been spent in the service of this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I will bear the case in mind; but I fear it would be difficult to draw a distinction between the Channel Islands and other parts of the British Dominions whose financial arrangements are separate from those of the United Kingdom.

Indian Army—Ex-Sandhurst Cadets and Ex-Militia Officers.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, whether he is aware that thirty-one Sandhurst cadets for appointment to the unattached list for the Indian Army, who passed the entrance examination in June–July, 1899, were gazetted on 28th July, 1900, and, if qualified, will be promoted captains on 28th July, 1909, and that the Indian Army List for 1st July 1908, shows, by footnotes (pp. 138 to 149a), that twenty-six officers now graded below the above-mentioned thirty-one ex-Sandhurst cadets will receive promotion to captain before 28th July, 1908, owing to their being permitted to count as service for promotion time spent in South Africa as Militia officers; whether among these ex-Militia officers, who in some cases entered the Army without any examination whatever, are some who actually failed in the Sandhurst entrance examination of the summer of 1899; whether, as the result, these ex-Militia officers will supersede the ex-Sandhurst cadets who were regular officers months before the former, the ex-Sandhurst cadets being therefore penalised for their success in the entrance examination; whether this was the intention of the military authorities; and, if not, whether the Secretary of State will have the matter reconsidered with a view of preventing this injustice.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) When it was decided that commissioned service in the South African War, previous to the attainment of a commission in the Regular Army, should be permitted to count towards promotion in the Indian Army, it was recognised that this concession would enable some officers specially commissioned in the Regular Army after field service to attain the successive ranks in the Indian Army sooner than officers commissioned from Sandhurst at earlier dates. I have no means of verifying the hon. Member's statement that amongst those who benefit by this concession are some unsuccessful competitors for Sandhurst; but, if it is so, the Secretary of State does not think that this is a sufficient reason for reconsidering the decision then arrived at.

Dismissals of Labourers and Artisans from Cork Barracks.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet received the report as to the dismissal of a large number of artisans and labourers from the Cork Barracks, where they had been for years employed, and the substitution of military men in their places; what is the rate of wages of the dismissed artisans, and what is the pay of the soldiers substituted for them; is this change in accordance with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House; and whether, in view of the widespread want of employment in Cork, and the efforts of the local representative bodies to cope with it, he will be good enough to withdraw the notices of dismissal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A field company of Royal Engineers has recently arrived at Cork Barracks. This company will, as a matter of course, be employed on some military work. No change has been made in the system of doing incidental repairs by the triennial contractor. The military authorities at Cork report that nothing is known of artisans and labourers being given notice of discharge.

Provision of Second Uniform for Territorial Army.

SIR SEYMOUR KING: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, although funds may be available to provide two suits of uniform for the Territorial Army, the provision of the second suit cannot be undertaken until a pattern for the walking-out dress is approved of; why it has taken seven months for the Army Council to settle this essential preliminary; how much longer delay may be expected; and whether he still suggests that it is the fault of the County Associations that the second suit has not yet been provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) County Associations were informed of the pattern of the second suit of uniform to be worn by the Territorial Force by special Army Order dated 12th June last, except in the case of the horse artillery, which required special consideration. Any delay in individual cases in approving the second suit after that date has been caused by applications made by units to vary the prescribed pattern, and these applications have only been received in the War Office within the last fortnight.

Stamp Duty on Share Options.

MR. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the expediency of broadening the basis of taxation for the next Budget, he will consider the advisability of imposing a stamp tax upon all time bargains in fictitious products, shares, and warrants which are not to be delivered, in order to check and control such gambling in options and futures, seeing that *bona fide* contracts are taxed and gambling Stock Exchange operations are left free and uncontrolled.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I can assure my hon. friend that my consideration will be given to this, as to all other modes of raising such revenue, as the circumstances of next year may require.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Protection of Life at Sea.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that about four years ago telephonic communication was established all round the coast of the British Islands with the coastguard stations, and the coastguards were required, when a ship went ashore or was in a dangerous position, to telephone to the nearest port, and in the case of fishing vessels to the owners or port of register for assistance; whether he is aware that this service has been invaluable to fishermen and the mercantile marine; whether this service is to be abandoned in the thirty-three coastguard stations that have already been closed this year; and, on the closing of the other stations, what steps, if any, will be taken to protect life and property by telephone service, as in many cases village telegraph offices are several miles from the shore and are not available during the night.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The coast communication system was instituted in 1892, and a full explanation of the extent to which, and method in which, it has been developed by the Post Office is given in Appendix D. of Command Paper 4091; it does not embrace all coastguard stations nor is it made through them only. There is no doubt that the system has been, and is of value to the mercantile marine and to fishermen. Sixteen of the thirty-three coastguard stations closed this year were connected with the system. I understand that the General Post Office is making such arrangements as are necessary in the circumstances.

Admiralty Contracts and Unemployment.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he has received a copy of a resolution passed by the Deptford Borough Council, at its meeting held on the 3rd instant, urging the Admiralty in view of the number of unemployed workmen in the riverside districts of London to apportion a share of shipbuilding and repairing work to firms having yards in the port of London; whether such request has been considered by the Admiralty; and, if so, with what result.

Mr. McKENNA: The repair of warships is reserved for the royal dockyards. The question of the acceptance of the tenders which have been received for the ships of this year's programme is now under the consideration of the Board of Admiralty, but with regard to the allocation of ship-building contracts, the Admiralty are bound to take into account considerations of price and comparative excellence of work.

Wages on Government Contracts at Portsmouth.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the code of working rules containing the wages and working conditions for navvies and labourers, signed by representatives of the contractors and the workmen in the Portsmouth district; and whether it is his intention to insist upon the contractors of his Department in that district observing such wages and working conditions.

Mr. McKENNA: My attention has been called to this matter, which is being carefully considered.

Rosyth Contract.

Mr. JOHN WARD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the contract for the new works at Rosyth will contain a clause making it impossible for the contractor to claim the bonus of £800 per week for any portion of time that the works might have been completed had there been no labour disputes, providing such disputes were caused by the contractors having failed to pay trade union rates of wages.

Mr. McKENNA: I must remind my hon. friend that trade union rates of wages are not specifically mentioned in the Fair Wages Clause which is a condition of all Admiralty contracts. With this limitation, the point raised by my hon. friend is fully provided for in the contract.

Naval Base at Cromarty Firth.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if it is proposed to establish a permanent naval base at Invergordon, in Cromarty Firth; and, if so, how much it is proposed to spend upon it during the financial year.

Mr. McKENNA: No, Sir.

Admiralty Orders at Cowes.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the total amount of the orders placed with Messrs. White's yard at Cowes by the Admiralty in each of the financial years 1905–6, 1906–7, 1907–8, and in 1908–9 up to the present date.

Mr. McKENNA: The total amounts of orders placed with Messrs. J. S. White & Co., Ltd., are as follows: 1905–6, £375,929; 1906–7, £289,236; 1907–8, £305,150; 1908–9 (contracts signed to date), £16,768.

Docks for Dreadnoughts.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if there is dock accommodation available on the East Coast of England or Scotland for the refit of the "Dreadnought" and the larger ships of the "Dreadnought" type now building; and, if so, how many ships will they accommodate at the same time.

Mr. McKENNA: Messrs. Stephenson & Co.'s dock at Hebburn-on-Tyne will accommodate one ship of either of the types specified when at somewhat less than her normal draught.

Mr. FELL: And is that the only dock on the East Coast?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, sir.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow. College) asked whether Rosyth would accommodate ships of this type.

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, when the dock is built.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) asked the right hon. Gentleman what he meant by "normal draught."

Mr. McKENNA: When she carries her normal amount of coal. The draught can be lightened by limiting the amount of coal carried.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): When is Rosyth likely to be ready?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

Baroda Educational System.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India has received any report as to the system of compulsory primary education introduced into the Baroda State; if so, whether the report is a favourable one; and whether the Government of India will take into consideration the advisability of introducing a similar system into British India.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The latest information tends to show that the free compulsory education scheme which was extended in 1906 to all parts of the Baroda State has on the whole worked satisfactorily. The Government of India are no doubt watching the experiment carefully.

Imports of Spirits into Brass.

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what quantities of gin and rum were imported into Brass in 1907.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The total quantity of spirits imported into Brass in 1907 was 155,800 gallons.

MR. ARMITAGE: Can the hon. Gentleman tell the House the difference between gin and rum?

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir; I must leave it to my hon. friend himself to decide what the difference is. Of course, if he wants technical details, I shall be happy to get them for him.

Gold Coast—Railway Rates on Spirits.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the reason for the reduction made in the railway rates on spirits in 1907 in the Gold Coast Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: It was represented by the Governor that the effect of the then existing rate, which was equivalent to more than 7s. 6d. per ton mile on the actual weight of spirit, was to divert all the spirits sent up to Coomassie from the railway to the carriers on the roads. The duties on spirits imported into the Gold Coast were already heavier than in any other Colony in West Africa; and it was considered that the change would not result in increased importation, but solely in the transfer to the railway of the bulk of the Ashanti spirit traffic. The Secretary of State is inquiring whether this anticipation was correct.

Fines in the Delta of the Niger.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if, when fines are paid in the delta of the Niger, any entry is made of the amount and nature of the payment.

COLONEL SEELY: The Answer is in the affirmative.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if fines were not paid in gin in the delta of the Niger, how were they paid, and who collects the fines.

COLONEL SEELY: Fines are paid in coin wherever, in view of the development of the country, it is possible to demand it. Where coin cannot be paid, fines are paid in kind, gin being expressly excluded by law. Fines are collected by order of the Courts and are paid into Court.

Gin as Currency.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if gin is a currency in the delta of the Niger, especially in the neighbourhood of Brass.

COLONEL SEELY: Gin is still used as a medium of exchange in some parts of the delta of the Niger, but the Government are doing all that they can to encourage the use of coin. They have recently introduced a new subsidiary coinage with results which are reported to be encouraging; but the extreme conservatism of the inhabitants of these districts renders the task a difficult one.

MR. FELL: What is the source of this gin? Is it Hamburg potato spirit?

COLONEL SEELY: It comes from various sources. I cannot say its precise nature, but I believe it is very nasty.

Imports of Specie into Brass.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what amount of specie was imported by merchants into Brass in 1907.

COLONEL SEELY: Specie to the value of £800 was imported into Brass in 1907, as against £500 in 1906.

Brass Produce.

MR. ARMITAGE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if produce is mainly bartered for spirits at Brass.

COLONEL SEELY: The produce exported from Brass in 1907 was valued at £72,100. The value of the goods imported, exclusive of freight charges and customs duties, was: Spirits, £14,900; other goods, £37,500. If the duties are added, the values are: Spirits, £42,200; other goods, £41,300.

Southern Nigeria—Sale of Spirits to Natives.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when he will be able to announce the formation of the Commission promised to inquire into the evil alleged to result from the sale of liquor to natives in Southern Nigeria, and the names of its component members; whether, in view of statements recently made by prominent officials in the Colony, a chairman will be sent out from this country to ensure fair and unprejudiced reception and consideration of the evidence to be taken by the Commission; what provision will be made for the representation of the Native Races and Liquor Traffic United Committee on the Commission; and whether it is understood to be the policy of His Majesty's Government to apply the same policy of restriction of supply of liquors to natives in Nigeria as in South Africa.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State is awaiting a communication from the Governor, but I hope it will not be long before I am in a position to make a statement as to the composition of the proposed Committee. Such a statement will, of course, include a reference to any representation of the Native Races and Liquor Traffic United Committee. I am not clear as to the meaning of the reference to the statements of prominent officials in the Colony, but the appointment of a chairman is a matter for the Secretary of State, and I am authorised by him to say that he is disposed to concur in the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that, if possible, a chairman should be sent out from this country. His Majesty's Government will reserve any statement as to policy until they have the Report of the Committee.

Trinidad.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the administration of the medical department of Trinidad; and, if so, can he state whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps having for their object the re-organisation of that Department on lines that will give to Trinidad a health ordinance on more modern lines.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has received no official representations on the subject, and he is not aware that any scheme of re-organisation is under the consideration of the Colonial Government.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Since the Indian coolies flourish so well in Trinidad, can it be said the condition of the place is so very bad?

COLONEL SEELY: We are doing our best to bring about an improvement.

Tropical Diseases.

SIR J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any instructions, and, if so, instructions of what character, have been addressed to the Governors of Colonies following upon Reports made by them relating to the prevention of malaria and other mosquito-borne diseases, in pursuance of requests addressed to them by the Secretary of State in June, 1906.

COLONEL SEELY: The periodical Reports received from the Governors in answer to the Secretary of State's circular despatch of June, 1906, are referred to the Advisory Committee for the Tropical Diseases Research Fund, and so far that Committee have not advised the issue of further instructions. A great deal of work in the desired direction is being done in the Colonies and while it is thought well not to overload the governors and their medical advisers with repeated instructions, the matter shall continue to have the most careful attention of the Secretary of State.

Venezuela and Trinidad.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the Resolution carried unanimously at a meeting of the Trinidad Chamber of Commerce, declaring that the Government of Venezuela, whilst availing itself of the full advantages afforded by the harbour and port of Trinidad, has prohibited the export of produce, except in insignificant quantity, from Venezuela to Trinidad, to the detriment and loss of merchants there, who in some cases have advanced moneys in respect of such produce, and requesting the Acting Governor to ascertain from His Majesty's Minister at Caracas the reason for such action on the part of the Government of Venezuela, or to take such other steps in the matter as might seem fit to His Excellency; and, if so, can he state what steps, if any, are being taken in regard to the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox): Yes, Sir; His Majesty's Minister at Caracas has asked for an explanation from the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs of the reason for the restrictions upon passenger and goods traffic, and he has been informed in reply that the restrictions on passenger traffic were due to the reappearance of plague in Trinidad, but that they had been removed and that the regulations regarding goods were those contained in the Finance Laws. Sir Vincent Corbett will be instructed to continue to take such action as may seem best adapted in the circumstances to secure the end in view.

German Imposts on Alcoholic Liquors.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can give any information as to the new imposts to be levied in Germany on alcoholic liquors; and whether he can state the total amount of new revenue which is thus proposed to be raised.

MR. MCKINNON WOOD: We have received from His Majesty's Embassy a copy of the proposals which the German Government have made public, and intend to submit to the Reichstag, providing for an increase in the duties on alcoholic liquors. According to these proposals, the German Government expect to obtain £5,000,000 from the tax on spirits, £5,000,000 from the tax on beer, and £1,000,000 from that on still wine in bottles.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): Does the hon. Gentleman mean pounds sterling or marks?

MR. MCKINNON WOOD: Pounds sterling.

MR REES: In view of the prevalence of taxation in this country, can nothing be done to keep down the taxation on Moselle?

[No Answer was returned.]

Pensions Officers' Excessive Duties.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been called to the inquest held last week at Birmingham on the death of Henry Mortished, a Revenue Officer, whose death it was alleged was due to excessive work in connection with old-age pensions; and whether, in view of the pressure of this work, about which there are loud complaints among the pensions officers, he will appoint an additional number of officers for the work.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I have seen a newspaper report of the inquest, from which it appears that a verdict of "accidental death" was returned in the case of the deceased officer, whose death has caused deep regret among his colleagues in the public service. The work entailed by the Old-age Pensions Act is undoubtedly heavy in some districts; but I ought to point out that, while it must necessarily be exceptionally severe at first when the initial applications are being received, there is certain to be a considerable decline later when the Act is working normally. While, therefore, I have given directions that assistance should at once be given, where it is found that the officers appointed to administer the Act have more work than they can adequately perform, I have hesitated to appoint a large number of additional officers with whose services it would be necessary to dispense after a short period.

MR. SNOWDEN: Has the right hon. Gentleman made calculations or has he instructed any of his officials to ascertain whether it is physically possible for any one man to do the work between October and December? Is he aware that there are many cases in which one pension officer has 1,000 cases, spread over a wide area, and that many cases necessitate two or three visits?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have no doubt that the pressure will be very severe during the next three months. We have between 500,000 and 600,000 applicants; but that is a purely temporary state of affairs due to the fact that we are beginning a new operation. Three or four months hence an officer, instead of having to deal with 1,000 cases, will probably have to deal with only ten or a dozen.

MR. SNOWDEN: I quite admit what the right hon. Gentleman says; but in the meantime are these men to be killed?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have already told the hon. Member that where there is exceptional strain of this character, wherever it is brought to our notice, we are dealing with it; and if any officer really feels that he is being overworked he has only to make out a case.

Cumberland and the Licensing Grant.

MR. HOWARD (Cumberland, Eskdale): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state what proportion of the £40,000 promised to the county councils for the expenses of collecting establishment licences will be payable to the county of Cumberland.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is estimated that £350 will be payable to the Cumberland County Council in respect of the surrendered licences.

Supplementary Distress Grant.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in framing the Supplementary Estimate for £100,000 towards the central fund for the relief of distress due to unemployment, he will leave himself free to make grants to approved agencies for dealing with unemployment, especially in connection with skilled artizans and women, in addition to distress committees.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The sum of £200,000 already voted was voted specifically in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, and it is now proposed that the further £100,000 should be voted as a supplement to that grant. The £100,000 will, therefore, be appropriated to the same purposes as the former grant, and will not be available for application in the manner suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would revise the form of the Estimate so as to widen the scope in which the money was to be applied, seeing that there were numerous applications for grants from areas in which no distress committees existed?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should like to have notice of that Question.

Marriage of Lunatics.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, looking at the increase of lunacy, he can see his way to recommending that a Bill should be brought in to prevent the marriages of those persons who have ever been confined in a lunatic asylum.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE Leeds, W.): No, Sir. It would be impossible to prohibit the marriage of all persons who have ever been confined in a lunatic asylum, because in many cases the mental trouble is of a limited and temporary nature. The recommendation on the subject in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Feeble-minded will be considered.

CAPTAIN FABER: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether lunacy is on the increase?

MR. GLADSTONE asked for notice.

Case of David Evans, of Aberdare.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of David Evans, who was recently sentenced by the stipendiary at Aberdare to one month's imprisonment for alleged assault; whether he is aware that, owing to an inadvertence on the part of a clerk to the solicitor who defended Evans, notice of appeal was not properly lodged within the time specified by the Act; that the prosecuting counsel agreed to waive this objection to the appeal being taken, but the stipendiary himself briefed counsel to oppose the application; and whether, seeing that Evans is a young man of good character and reputation, who claims to have been the party assaulted, and produced strong and uncontradicted evidence at the trial in support of this, under all these circumstances, he will cause him to be immediately released.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have made inquiry into this case, but on the information before me, I see no sufficient reason for interference. It does not appear that any fresh evidence would have been called if the defendant's appeal had been heard, and the fact that, owing to the mistake of his solicitor, it could not be heard, does not seem to me to afford sufficient ground for advising any interference with the sentence.

S.S. "Taunton"—Disobedient Seamen.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department with regard to the sentence of fourteen days' imprisonment for disobedience of lawful commands passed, on 23rd October last, by the Barry magistrates on four seamen of the steamship "Taunton," whether any part of this sentence has been remitted; and, if so, upon what grounds.

MR. GLADSTONE: I advised the remission of the sentence after the men had served one week, as there appeared to me to be reason to believe that the offence charged was due to a *bona fide* difference of opinion as to what a seaman's proper work is when a ship is taking in cargo; the offence had been committed at Philadelphia in August, 1907.

Imports of Ship Plates and Tram Rails.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the amount of ship plates and tramway rails imported into this country from Germany and Belgium during the past year; their cost per ton, as also the cost per ton of similar material manufactured in this country; further, the amount of royalties per ton levied in the countries named, as compared with the royalties per ton levied in this country; and also as to whom the royalties are paid in each of the countries.

MR. CHURCHILL: I will have a statement printed in the Votes showing the quantity, value, and average value per ton of tram rails and iron and steel plates and sheets imported into the United Kingdom from Germany and Belgium in 1907. I have no official information as to the average cost of tramway rails, or ship plates manufactured in the United Kingdom, but I am appending to the printed statement some information as to the average declared values of our exports of those manufactures to all destinations. I have no information as to the extent to which royalties paid on the raw materials enter into the cost of manufacture of the finished articles.

The following statement [printed in the Votes] gives the information asked for by the hon. Member so far as it is available—

Statement showing the Quantity, Value, and Average Value per ton of Imported Tram Rails and Ship, &c., Plates and Sheets of Iron and Steel consigned to the United Kingdom from Germany and Belgium during the year 1907 :—

Country whence Consigned to the United Kindgnom.	Quantity.	Value.	Average Value per ton.
	Ship, Bridge, Boiler and other Plates and Sheets not under $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick.		
	Tons.	£	£ s. d.
Germany	12,999	107,016	8 4 8
Belgium	20,244	149,346	7 7 7
	Ship, Bridge, Boiler and other Plates and Sheets under $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick.		
	Tons.	£	£ s. d.
Germany	5,627	49,122	8 14 7
Belgium	10,470	85,926	8 4 2
	Tram Rails with grooved heads, for Tramways worked by horse or by mechanical power.		
	Tons.	£	£ s. d.
Germany	858	5,564	6 9 8
Belgium	1,362	8,766	6 8 9

NOTE.—There is no official information as to the average cost of the above articles manufactured in the United Kingdom, but the following statement shows the quantity, value, and average value per ton of tram rails and ship, &c., plates and sheets of iron and steel of British manufacture, exported from the United Kingdom to all destinations during the year 1907 :—

	Quantity.	Value.	Average Value per ton.
	Tons.	£	£ s. d.
Ship, Bridge, Boiler and other Plates and Sheets : Not under $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick	232,622	1,832,911	7 17 7
Under $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick...	67,591	772,348	11 8 6
Tram Rails, with grooved heads for Tramways worked by horse or by mechanical power ...	4,077	69,284	16 19 11

Railway Combines.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that interference with combinations or other mutual arrangements for working traffic, enforcing rates, withdrawing rebates, pooling receipts, abolishing inter-competition and establishing community of interest, which have been entered into since 1905 by various railway companies in Great Britain, will compel the companies concerned to compete at a loss, or to pay merely nominal returns upon their invested capital, he will state under what statute he possesses authority to disapprove or disallow such combinations or mutual arrangements.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): Prior to 1873 working agreements entered into by railway companies under the authority of special Acts, either incorporating Part III. of the Railway Clauses Act, 1863, or containing similar provisions, required the approval of the Board of Trade, but in that year the Railway Commissioners, now the Railway and Canal Commissioners, were established, and the powers of the Board with respect to such agreements were transferred to them. Under Section 17 of the Railway Regulation Act of 1844 the Board of Trade may apply to the Courts for an injunction if they are of opinion that a railway company is acting *ultra vires*, and that it would be for the public advantage that they should be restrained from so acting.

MR. REES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that over half the railway stock in this country is held in parcels of £500 and upwards, and that the return on it averages 3¼ per cent.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman cannot be expected to know everything. Notice must be given.

American Copyright Act.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether having regard to the prejudicial effect on the British printing trade of the operation of the American Copyright Act, by which authors in this country, in order to secure copyright in the United States, are required to deposit there two copies of their work printed from type set up in those States, in consequence of which books intended largely for home circulation are printed in America, he will consider the advisability of restricting the copyright in books of British authors to books printed from type set up in this country, and of requiring America authors to print in this country any books the copyright of which they desire to secure in the United Kingdom.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know if the hon. Member is aware that the adoption of his suggestion would involve the retirement of this country from the Copyright Union, and the sacrifice of the advantages which are derived from participation in that union. I am not prepared to recommend the adoption of the course referred to.

International Copyright Conference.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when the English translation promised by him of the suggested alterations in international copyright, being discussed at the International Conference now sitting at Berlin, will be printed and obtainable.

MR. CHURCHILL: I informed the hon. Member for Leicester on 19th October that I would have a translation issued if he desired it, but I understood that he did not so desire. The document referred to is now out of date, having been superseded by amended proposals brought forward by various countries from time to time at the Conference itself. To issue a translation at the present time would therefore be useless and misleading.

Canadian Trade Correspondents.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when it is proposed to appoint trade correspondents for the new Canadian provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; and why are appointments for Montreal and Toronto being delayed pending the Report of the Trade Commissioner.

MR. CHURCHILL: In view of the absence of important trade centres in Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is not, at present, thought necessary to appoint trade correspondents in either of those provinces, but if it appears expedient in the future such correspondents will be appointed. Appointments for Montreal and Toronto are being delayed until it is definitely decided what city His Majesty's Trade Commissioner shall make his headquarters.

MR. WATT: Will the right hon. Gentleman, when he makes these appointments, see that business men are chosen, and not lawyers or soldiers?

MR. BARRIE: On whose authority are these appointments made?

MR. CHURCHILL: The appointments emanate from the Board of Trade.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what has been the previous commercial experience of Mr. R. Grigg, the British Trade Commissioner for Canada.

MR. CHURCHILL: I fully satisfied myself of Mr. Grigg's qualifications for the post in question prior to appointing him thereto. He is neither a lawyer nor a soldier. He has been engaged for many years in business in this country, besides possessing an intimate knowledge of Canada. Mr. Grigg has recently conducted a commercial mission in the Dominion for the Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade on Commercial Intelligence. His Report upon his mission has been laid before the House.

Distress Works.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will give the percentages of men who worked on distress works during last December, January, and February, respectively, for six, five, four, three, and two days consecutively in each case; and also the percentages of those who only worked one day at a time.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am sorry that the information in my possession does not enable me to give the particulars desired by the hon. Member.

Poor Relief for the Aged.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in the Administrative County of London; and whether he can state the number of such persons in the receipt of Poor Law relief on 1st January, 1908.

I beg also to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in England (not including Monmouthshire) and in Wales (including Monmouthshire); and if he will state the number of such persons in receipt if Poor Law relief on 1st January, 1908, on each country.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I hope my hon. friend will allow me to answer together these Questions. The number of persons seventy years of age and upwards in the middle of the present year is estimated as follows: Administrative County of London, 115,000; England, excluding Monmouthshire, 898,000; Wales and Monmouthshire, 59,000. The average daily number of persons of that age who have been in receipt of Poor Law relief during the year (exclusive of lunatics in asylums) is estimated as follows: Administrative County of London, about 31,000; England, excluding Monmouthshire, about 220,000; Wales and Monmouthshire, about 16,000. These figures as to pauperism must be taken as rough estimates only.

Hackney Marshes—Proposed Model Yacht Lake.

MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received any communication from the Eastern Model Yacht Association, asking for his interest in the establishment of a model yacht lake for the East End of London in Hackney Marshes; and whether, seeing that such a lake would be one method of draining the marshes as well as of providing work for the unemployed during this winter, he will consider favourably this application.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS : I have received a communication from the commodore of the association referred to, and am suggesting that he might place his proposals before the Central (Unemployed) Body.

Mortlake Motor Fatality.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been drawn to an inquiry held in the Coroner's Court at Mortlake, on the 12th ultimo, into the death of a chaufieur killed in a collision with a motor bus near Barnes Common, the jury adding a rider to their verdict recommending that, in consequence of the increase in the number of accidents caused by motor driving within twelve miles of Charing Cross, the speed of motor vehicles should be reduced ; and whether consideration has been given to such recommendation, and, if so, with what result.

Mr. JOHN BURNS : My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. My attention has been drawn to the recommendation of the jury in the case mentioned. I am not empowered to make a general reduction in the speed of motor vehicles in any district in the absence of an application from the proper local authority. But if such an application is made to me in respect of any specified limits or place, the matter will receive my consideration.

Mr. BOWERMAN : Do these recommendations come before the right hon. Gentleman personally ?

Mr. JOHN BURNS : Yes, everything of this kind comes under my personal observation.

Mr. MYER (Lambeth, N.) : Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that last Sunday afternoon in Hammersmith a motor was going along at four miles an hour ?

*Mr. SPEAKER : The hon Member had better give notice of that.

Mr. BOWERMAN: Has the right hon. Gentleman received many recommendations similar to the one referred to ?

Mr. JOHN BURNS : No, Sir. I can only say that out of twenty-one applications submitted to me I have sanctioned reduction of speed, I think, in eighteen cases.

Motor Speeds in Hyde Park.

Mr. BOWERMAN : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that the speed of motor cars and motor cabs using Hyde Park is restricted to ten miles per hour, he will consider the desirability of applying the same limitation of speed to all mechanically driven vehicles using the public streets of the Metropolis, in which the danger to life and limb from high speed motor-driving is necessarily greater than in the royal parks.

Mr. JOHN BURNS : The limitation on the speed of motor cars in Hyde Park was imposed under the powers conferred on the Commissioners of His Majesty's Works by the special legislation relating to the Royal Parks. As regards the streets of the Metropolis, regulations for the reduction of the speed of motor cars in them could only be made under the Motor Car Act, 1903, and on the application of the local authorities, viz., the County Council and the common council.

Mr. BOWERMAN : Is the risk to life and limb not greater in the streets of London ?

Mr. JOHN BURNS : If that be so, and the London County Council and the Corporation of the City of London make representations to me, I shall not be reluctant to act.

School Attendance Regulations.

Mr. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.) : I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, having regard to the provisions of the Education Code, Schedule II., Clause 39, a child proposed for admission to a higher elementary school must have attended at a public elementary school for two years ; and, having regard to the provisions of the Education Bill to the effect that contracted-out schools will no longer be regarded as public elementary schools, whether he will consider the advisability of providing that children educated in such contracted-out schools should not be debarred from the benefits of such higher elementary schools.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): In the event of the Education Bill becoming law it will be made clear in the Code that attendance for two years at an elementary school in receipt of grant will satisfy the requirement to which the hon. Member refers.

Scholars in Elementary Schools.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the latest available figures of the number of scholars on the registers of public elementary schools in England and Wales.

MR. TREVELYAN: The latest available figures relate to the statistical year ending 31st July, 1907, when the number was 6,003,772. The figures for the statistical year ending 31st July, 1908, will be available in about a month.

Devonport Naval Engineering College.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in the case of a master recently dismissed from the Royal Naval Engineering College at Devonport, solely with the view to the winding up of that college, the award of £99 3s. 4d. a year as a pension was made by the Treasury on a full and unfettered consideration of the circumstances of his particular case or under the limitations of some, and what, departmental rule.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The award was made under Section 7 of the Superannuation Act, 1859 (the provisions of which are permissive in character), after a full consideration of all the circumstances of the case. It was made by the Treasury in the exercise of their discretion under that section, due regard being had to the practice of previous Boards of Treasury in dealing with similar cases in recent years.

Edinburgh Relief Works.

SIR GEORGE McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that a dispute has arisen between the Town Council of Edinburgh and the distress committee as to a claim by the distress committee for repayment out of the rates of a sum of £3,700 disbursed on relief work for the unemployed, including wages and the expense of working a farm colony; whether the Local Government Board (Scotland) is prepared to advise that this payment is legal under The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905; and, if not, what action he proposes to take in the matter.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Yes, Sir, I am aware that such a difference has arisen. This difference raises a point of considerable doubt; and while the Local Government Board have expressed the view that it does not lie with the Town Council to refuse payment of the demand made, I may point out that where such differences cannot be overcome in any other way the procedure of Sections 175 and 176 of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, is provided by Article 16 of the Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed) (Scotland), 1905, as the method of settling such disputes by law. In answer to the second part of the Question, I have to say that the Local Government Board has not yet been called upon to consider and decide any question relative to the legality of any payment made by the distress committee out of the central fund. The statutory duty in this regard does not fall to be performed until the matter is brought under their notice on a Report by the auditor appointed under the Act to examine the accounts of the distress committee. I do not propose, therefore, to take any action in this matter, but I may express the hope that amicable adjustment may be attained without resorting to extreme measures.

Sir GEORGE McCRAE: Is it not the fact that this matter has already been before the Local Government Board of Scotland and that there is a complete deadlock, with the result that the distress committee is being handicapped in its action.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think so. As I have said, I hope there will be an amicable settlement.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): Is the decision in these legal matters taken by the Local Government Board's own responsibility or on the responsibility of the Law Officers?

Mr. SINCLAIR: There has been no decision in this case.

Aged Paupers in Scotland.

Mr. TIMOTHY DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in Scotland; and whether he can give the number of such persons in receipt of Poor Law relief on 1st January, 1908.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The estimated number of persons over seventy years of age in Scotland at 1st January, 1908, was 133,730. The old-age pauperism figures collected at present by the Local Government Board for Scotland are in respect of persons over sixty-five and not seventy, but it is contemplated adding a column for the number of paupers over seventy in the next Return.

Afforestation in Ireland.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the unanimous resolution of the Cork Council on 3rd instant on the subject of the important Report of the Departmental Committee on Irish Forestry in April last urging the Department to take practical steps towards carrying out the national scheme of afforestation recommended by the Committee and pledging the county council to co-operate with the Department by every means within its power; and whether, in view of the public feeling in Ireland in favour of a national scheme of afforestation, and of the amount of employment of a reproductive character which such a scheme would involve at a period of the year when employment is most needed, the Department are prepared to take prompt action in this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT of the DEPARTMENT of AGRICULTURE for IRELAND (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.): The Department have received the resolution referred to. I regret that I am not at present in a position to add anything to the Answers I have given to previous Questions on this subject.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): Do the Estates Commissioners possess power to purchase woods in the landlord's hands when estates are being sold with a view to the preservation of the timber?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: They have power to purchase, but the practice has been in the past to sell them to timber merchants to be cut down.

Captain DONELAN: Were not the famous Dundrum Woods purchased by the Commissioners.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes, and they afterwards passed into the hands of the Department for preservation.

Irish Creamery Butter.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland whether he will explain why home-made hand-separator butter is entitled to be called creamery; is he aware that large quantities of such butter are at present sold as creamery; has the Department from time to time received representations from the Irish Creamery Managers' Association and other bodies on this subject; and will he state whether he intends to take any steps in the matter.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department have appointed a Committee with the view of arriving at a definition of creamery butter.

Irish Surprise Butter Competitions.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that 128 creameries entered for the summer surprise butter competitions in 1907; that out of that number ninety-five sent butter to the first competition, 122 to the second, 116 to the third, twenty-nine to the fourth, and thirty-two to the fifth; whether he is aware that the falling-off in the number of exhibits sent to the fourth and fifth competitions was due to the dissatisfaction caused by the appointment of a Mr. Carroll as creamery instructor; and if the above figures are correct, will he explain how they are to be reconciled with the statement that twenty-eight creameries, not 100, withdrew from these competitions.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The figures are accurate, and in view of the circumstances I am considering the discontinuance of these competitions.

Cattle-Driving Prosecutions.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the procedure of arresting persons charged with cattle-driving and bringing them before a single resident magistrate out of petty sessions, with a view to their being bound over to future good behaviour, under the statute of Edward III., has been adopted in pursuance of instructions issued by the Executive Government; what are the circumstances under which the practice of proceeding in such cases by summons was departed from; on what date were the instructions referred to issued; and will he state whether the effect of the altered procedure has been a diminution in the number of cattle-drives.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The procedure referred to in the Question has been adopted for many years, and long before the present Government came into office, by the police in Ireland in the case of agrarian disturbances. The police in this as in other matters act under the instructions of the Executive Government. No special instructions were issued as regards cases of cattle-driving, but as in other cases, instructions from time to time are given with regard to each case. As there has been no recent alteration in either the practice or procedure, it is unnecessary for me to answer the latter part of the hon. Member's Question.

MR. LONSDALE: On what date were the instructions issued?

MR. CHERRY: No instructions of a general character were issued, but as cases arose the Central Government sent instructions to the police.

Aged Paupers in Ireland.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of persons over seventy years of age in Ireland; and if he can state the number of such persons in receipt of Poor Law relief on 1st January, 1908.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The number of persons in Ireland aged seventy years and upwards was, at the date of the last census, 187,315. As regards the remainder of the Question I would refer to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a Question asked by the hon. Member for North Sligo on 15th October. In that reply the number of persons in Ireland over seventy years of age then in workhouses, or who had been recipients of outdoor relief since 1st January last, was estimated at 32,000.

Longford Labourers' Cottages.

MR. J. PHILLIPS (Longford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the Local Government Board for Ireland have refused to sanction a loan of £30,996 applied for by the Longford Rural District Council for the purpose of the Longford Rural District Labourers (Unopposed) Order, 1908, having regard to the fact that the council's application is based on the amount actually approved of by the Local Government Board, namely, £133 4s. 4d. for building each cottage and fencing plot attached thereto, on the amount (or within £2 of it) allowed by the arbitrator, namely, £33 5s. 4d. for the purchase of each acre of land acquired under the Order, and on a sum of £12 per cottage which has been set aside to pay incidental expenses.

Mr. BIRRELL: The loan applied for by the Longford Rural District Council is at the rate of £182 15s. per cottage, which the Local Government Board consider too high, and the Board have informed the district council that they are not prepared to advance a loan at this rate out of the limited fund provided by the Labourers Act of 1906. The Board have, however, expressed their willingness to sanction a loan of £170 per cottage which they think should be sufficient, and, should this prove inadequate, to consider the propriety of authorising the district council to obtain a supplemental loan in the open market.

Irish Old-Age Pension Appeals.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say what steps will be taken by the Local Government Board for Ireland to deal with appeals arising under the Old-Age Pensions Act; and when, and by whom, will these claims be investigated.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board will deal with appeals as they arise, after consideration of the evidence and documents submitted to them by the pension committees and the appellants. If further information is necessary, the Board will obtain it by local investigation through their inspectors, and where questions of law are involved, they will be guided by legal advice.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Will the Local Government Board itself deal with the appeals, so as to expedite the working of the Act?

Mr. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

Untenanted Lands—Landlords' Appeals.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say what is the procedure adopted by the Estates Commissioners in respect to appeals lodged by landowners objecting to the compulsory acquisition of untenanted land by the Commissioners, with a view to the reinstatement of evicted tenants; whether notice of the landlord's intention to appeal, and the alleged grounds for appealing, are communicated to the evicted tenants or their representatives; has the landlord the opportunity of making *ex parte* statements to the Commissioners in person or by solicitor or counsel, whilst the evicted tenant has no opportunity of stating his case or tendering rebutting evidence; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps to secure equality of treatment in these appeal cases.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the procedure on appeals under the Evicted Tenants Act 1907, is prescribed by Rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland.* When an appeal is taken from an order of the Commissioners they take no further action until the appeal is determined. The Commissioners give notice to all persons interested in the land of their intention to acquire lands under the Act, and it is open to all parties to communicate freely with them.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

Mr. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when he will introduce his promised Bill dealing with the pay and pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary; and whether, as he stated over a year ago that the matter had been too long delayed, he will make the provisions of the Bill retrospective so as to cover the current year.

*Mr. BIRRELL: I had intended to take the Committee stage on Monday, but find that it is not an available day. I hope to take it to-morrow, after setting up the Committee to-night. When the financial resolution has been passed the Bill will be introduced at the earliest possible moment, and will, I hope, become law before the end of the session. It is not proposed to make the operation of the Act retrospective.

---

* Published in the *Dublin Gazette*.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): May I ask what time to-night? Because I may say to the right hon. Gentleman that it is a very controversial Motion, and will take some time.

Mr. BIRRELL: I cannot believe that it is.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): May I ask what is the amount of money involved, and whether it would not be better applied in helping to settle the Irish Land question?

Mr. BIRRELL: The police have their rights in this matter. It proceeds upon a recommendation of this House, the whole matter is overdue, and there should be no further delay.

Mr. MOONEY: May I again ask the Chief Secretary at what time of the night he will take it? It does not appear on the Order Paper.

Captain CRAIG: The Chief Secretary says it is long overdue; is not that a reason for making it retrospective?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am told it will be taken after the Port of London Bill.

Mr. MOONEY: On a point of order, can a Resolution of this kind be taken without its having appeared on the Notice Paper?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member mean the setting up of the Committee?

Mr. MOONEY: Yes.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That can be taken at any time. The Motion that this House resolve into a Committee can be taken at any time.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): In consequence of what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, may I ask him whether he seriously takes the view that this is a non-controversial measure?

Mr. BIRRELL: I think after this matter is explained to the House, and after I have explained the purposes of the Bill, it will be non-controversial.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: We all know the purpose of it.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Committee is already set up, and, therefore, no Motion will be necessary.

Mr. MOONEY: Is it not a fact that on the papers issued this morning there is a statement that he intends to take this on Monday next, which is an allotted day, and is he not, therefore, springing it on the House?

Mr. BIRRELL: In answer to the Question, I said I hoped to take it on Monday.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman seriously intend to take this Motion to-night without notice? I must be allowed to say that if he does, it will meet with the most strenuous opposition. Will he answer?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am very much surprised that there should be opposition to this matter, very much surprised indeed, but after what has fallen from the hon. and learned Member, I will not proceed.

Irish Police Warning to Newspapers.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the result of the warning recently given to certain newspapers against publishing the intimidatory resolutions of the United Irish League branches; what proceedings he intends to take within the ordinary law against the proprietors of newspapers who continue to publish these resolutions; and whether he will take action also against the organisations who pass the resolutions and are responsible for the intimidation which is practised.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is not yet possible to estimate the results of the warnings which have been given. It would be neither possible nor desirable to say what proceedings may in certain events become necessary. Each case will be considered upon its merits. Prosecutions will be instituted in all cases in which evidence of a criminal offence is forthcoming.

Excluded Tenants.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has from time to time received many public representations as to the position of agricultural tenants excluded from the operations of the existing land laws; and whether it is proposed to legislate for the claims of these excluded tenants in the forthcoming Land Bill.

Mr. BIRRELL: Numerous representations with regard to the position of excluded tenants have been made to me and are receiving consideration. I do not think it desirable to discuss the provisions of the forthcoming Land Bill pending its introduction.

Firearm Outrages.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will inquire from the Inspector-General whether in some cases serious outrages, such as firing at the person and firing into and outside dwelling-houses, were not brought to the knowledge of the police until several days after their occurrence, and then not by the individuals whose persons or property were attacked, but by others; whether the Inspector-General attributes this condition of affairs to the fact that the individuals in question were too terrorised to report such outrages; and whether he will state what action he proposes to take to secure that the operation of the ordinary law will overcome incidents of this nature.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that it sometimes occurs that offences of the nature referred to are not reported to the police by the aggrieved persons, but come to their knowledge from other sources. The failure to report such cases is, the Inspector-General believes, usually attributable to other causes than that suggested in the Question. There is no reason to believe that such cases have increased in number, or that it would be possible to prevent them from occasionally happening.

Captain CRAIG: What other reasons are there than terrorism on the part of the people?

Mr. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General informs me that the reasons are not those suggested in the Question.

Cork County Prosperity.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has observed that the secretary of the Cork County Council has reported that of £88,000 due in rates for that county for the last half-year only £172 remained uncollected at the date of the report; whether he is aware that Cork is the county where far the largest number of land purchases has taken place in Ireland; that arrears of instalments of purchase money due to the Land Commission in that county are virtually non-existent; that no cattle-driving has taken place there; and that no extra police have had to be quartered on the county; and whether, in view of this state of facts, he will, in the highest interest of the Empire and of all parties in this House, accelerate and complete the abolition of dual ownership in the county of Cork and in the rest of Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am glad to say that the satisfactory description of the condition of the County Cork given by the hon. Member is substantially correct. It is the intention of the Government to do what it possibly can to make land purchase proceed as quickly as possible.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total amount of purchase money represented by agreements under the Purchase Act of 1903 up to 1st November last, with the number of purchasers and area of land covered by the agreements; what is the amount of purchase money remaining unpaid at that date; what is the number of tenant purchasers who have agreed to pay 3½, 3¾, and 4 per cent. interest, respectively, on the purchase money pending completion of the sales; what is the annual amount of the loss sustained by each of these categories of tenant purchasers as compared with the annuity of 3¼, to which their payments would be reduced if the purchase money were available; and, in case the failure to supply the purchase money should continue for five years or over, what will be the total loss to the tenant purchasers up to the time when their ownership will begin; and whether the forthcoming Bill will make any provision to remedy this injustice.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the purchase agreements lodged up to the 1st instant are being scheduled as rapidly as possible, and until this has been completed, the Commissioners will not be in a position to state the amount of the purchase money applied for in such agreements, nor the amount of purchase money applied for but not advanced on that date. The agreements are not classified according to the rate of interest which the tenants have agreed to pay, which is a matter for arrangement between the parties. The Commissioners are, therefore, unable to give the information asked for in the concluding part of the Question. They are, of course, aware that interest at 3½ per cent. and higher rates is paid, and it necessarily follows that until the advance is made the tenants are at a loss represented by the difference between such rate of interest and the annuity of 3¼ per cent.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Do I understand that the Estates Commission do not inquire what rate of interest the tenants covenant to pay?

MR. BIRRELL: They only know it from the papers before them.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: How soon will they supply this information, which is so vital to the point, as to what the present purchasers are losing by the present arrangement?

MR. BIRRELL: Having regard to the fact that in the week ending 31st October purchase agreements involving £6,500,000 were lodged, the hon. Member will realise that the work of scheduling is one of enormous difficulty. Overtime is being worked in order that the information may be forthcoming at the earliest possible moment.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Will it be forthcoming by Monday week?

MR. BIRRELL: I hope so.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Inasmuch as the Land Commission collects the interest, how is it possible they do not know the rate?

MR. BIRRELL: The difficulty is that the agreements are not classified according to the rate of interest paid.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): But is the rate not set out in the agreement lodged by the landlord?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, but in the absence of classification it is impossible to say off-hand how many tenants pay 3½ per cent. and how many 4 per cent.

Templemore Bomb Outrage.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a bomb outrage was committed on Sunday, 27th October last, at the residence of Mr. Francis O'Mullane, of Templemore, county Tipperary; whether the police can state what led to the attack on Mr. O'Mullane; what arrests have been made; and what sentences passed.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. and gallant Member asks what sentences have been passed in a case which only happened on the 25th of last month. In this case a person is under arrest and the proceedings against him are pending. It would be undesirable in the interests of justice to enter into particulars of the case while the proceedings are *sub judice*.

Ballinacurra Drainage Scheme.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the condition of the Ballinacurra district at Limerick in connection with the question of sewerage; when was the Provisional Order passed; have the district council applied to the Local Government Board to send down an arbitrator, and has the request been yet complied with; is he aware that disease has broken out in this district and that deaths have occurred, which are attributed to the want of proper sewerage; and will he see that the Local Government Board hasten this necessary work.

Mr. BIRRELL: A Provisional Order authorising the district council to acquire certain lands compulsorily for the purpose of carrying out a sewerage scheme for the district named has been made by the Local Government Board and was confirmed by Parliament on 1st August last. Copies of the Act were not available till the middle of October, when a copy was sent to the council with directions for the preparation of the maps and schedules required for arbitration purposes. The district council have asked the Board to send down an arbitrator, but this cannot be done until these maps and schedules are furnished. No cases of infectious disease at Ballinacurra have been recently reported to the Board.

County Clare Cattle-Drives.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a series of cattle-drives took place during the latter end of October in County Clare, cattle being driven, as to twenty-five, the property of Mr. Thomas A. Gorman, J.P., as to seventy-five, the property of Mr. Hardy, and as to thirty, the property of Mr. Patrick Cahir; can he state if all have been recovered and restored to their owners; were those concerned in the outrages armed; were any shots fired; how many arrests have been made in each instance; and what sentences have been passed.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am aware that the cattle-drives referred to in the Question took place. All the cattle were recovered and restored to the owners. The person or persons who had drove these cattle did so at night and unnoticed. It is not, therefore, known whether they were armed or whether they fired any shots, nor has it of course been possible to make any arrests.

Ireland—Old-Age Pension Officers.

Mr. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can say how many pension officers and how many supervisors have been appointed for Ireland under the Old-Age Pensions Act; and what are the areas assigned to both classes of officers.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: As regards the first part of the Question, I may perhaps be allowed to refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave on the 9th instant to a Question by the hon. Member for the Ossory Division of Queen's County. I regret that the information asked for in the second part of the Question could not be supplied in detail without a disproportionate expenditure of time and labour; but I may say generally that each pension officer is responsible for the areas of one or more sub-committees as the case may be, and each pension officer appointed to be a supervisor has the supervision of the work of five or six other pension officers.

Administration of Distress Funds.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in the event of a locality where no distress committee is in existence setting up a voluntary committee with a scheme of work for the unemployed, an application from such a committee for a grant from the central fund will be favourably considered.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): The grant is voted for contributions in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act. Consequently payments out of it can only be made to central bodies and distress committees under the Act. A voluntary committee would not come within the terms of the Vote.

Tuberculosis Among Soldiers.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the promotion of the Government of the Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill, if he can state whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt the recommendations of the Select Committee as to tuberculosis amongst soldiers, about 350 of whom are discharged every year suffering from this disease, and in regard to whom no provision for treatment is made by the State.

MR. ASQUITH: I can add nothing to the statements already made by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War in regard to this matter. As has been stated the Government are not prepared to adopt the recommendations of the Departmental Committees which inquired into the subject.

MR. SUMMERBELL: And meantime these discharges of soldiers help to spread the disease all over the country.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Why should these soldiers be saddled on the rates in Ireland?

MR. ASQUITH: I have nothing to add to the very full Answer on this matter given by my right hon. friend.

Small Holdings—Intimidation by Landlords.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to instances of agricultural labourers who had applied for small holdings being dismissed by their employers; and whether the Government will consider the possibility of introducing legislation to make it a criminal offence for a employer to dismiss a labourer merely upon the ground that he has availed himself of the right conferred upon him by Parliament of applying for a small holding under the Small Holdings Act.

MR. ASQUITH: No instance has, so far, been brought to my attention in which there was satisfactory proof that a labourer had been dismissed on this ground by his employer. I can hardly imagine conduct which would constitute a more serious and indefensible attempt to defeat the intentions of Parliament, and I cannot believe, as at present advised, that it is likely to be resorted to.

Port of London Bill.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that under the new arrangement of business the opportunity for discussing the question of the purchase of the docks might only arise in the middle of the night, and that question was not discussed on either the First or the Second Reading of the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman would arrange that Clause 3 should not be taken after 11 p.m.

MR. ASQUITH: Both to-day and to-morrow we shall be discussing this Bill. We have no intention of sitting late, and I think there will be adequate opportunity for the discussion my hon. friend desires.

MR. LOUGH: But will the right hon. Gentleman agree not to take this clause after 11 p.m.?

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir.

The Public Galleries.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask you a Question of which I have given you private notice. It is, when it is your intention to reopen the public and ladies' galleries.

*MR. SPEAKER: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I have made such inquiry as I could so as to obtain the general sense of the House, and I have not hitherto observed any feverish anxiety to reopen either of the galleries. At the same time, I am considering from day to day under what conditions the galleries might be reopened, and what safeguards might be taken to preserve our debates from any interference.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I respectfully ask, Sir, whether while these galleries are vacant additional accommodation might not be provided for the Press, in view of the fact that its accommodation is very restricted at the present time?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter which the hon. Member had better put to the First Commissioner of Works.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I put it to the First Commissioner now.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): That is a Question I had better have notice of. I am not aware that I have any control over the galleries now vacant.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, since the Speaker has been good enough to refer me to him, whether he could refer me to somebody else?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

(PORT OF LONDON BILL.)

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Port of London Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 235; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 372.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. John Hon.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
MacVeagh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.

Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W. Monm'th
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
WhiteJ.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson,Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Barrie,H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birm'gham)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Glover, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness,Hon.R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E.(Bury S.Edm.)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hodge, John
Jowett, F. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederlk Wm.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson,Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Radford, G. H.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliffe, Major R. F.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant,James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilkie, Alexander
Winterton, Earl
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (LICENSING BILL) (ALLOCATION OF TIME ON REPORT STAGE).

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he rose to move the Motion standing in his name with regard to the allocation of time for the Report stage of the Licensing Bill. The House resolved last July that five days of Parliamentary time should be allotted to this stage of the measure. Of course, it was no longer open to them to consider or discuss the question whether that was or was not an adequate provision of time, but the House at the same time adopted what he ventured to think a very wise innovation on the procedure which had hitherto been established in regard to closure Resolutions, by reserving till the close of the Committee stage, when the course of the discussion would have made it clear what topics had arisen in the debate which required further consideration, the manner in which, as between the five days resolved upon, the different clauses should be apportioned. He would point out by way of summary that the number of clauses discussed in Committee was nineteen, the number undiscussed was twenty-eight, one clause was dropped, and one added. Of the twenty-eight undiscussed clauses, twelve were not opposed. Therefore, it was fair to assume that of the undiscussed clauses, at the outside sixteen presented nothing in the nature of controversial matter. Of the seven Schedules, four were discussed, and one of the remainder was not opposed at all. That was the situation as it confronted them now in regard to the actual employment of the time during the nineteen allotted days in Committee. In those circumstances, it became the duty of the Government to endeavour to allocate as fairly as they could the five days for the Report stage. The governing principle, which he thought the House in all quarters would agree they rightly had in view, was to allow the House to consider first of all any new proposals of the Government, and next any Amendments which the Government proposed to introduce in order to carry out promises given during the Committee stage. Subject to the time given for the consideration of these new proposals, the table had been arranged so far as possible to allow further discussion on the most important parts of the Bill. He said at once that he should listen with interest, and with every desire to consider them, to any criticisms or suggestions which could be made from any quarter as to the precise allocation of time which they proposed. With that preface, it would be perhaps convenient that he should discuss *seriatim* the proposed allocation as between the successive days. The first day, which would be Friday—the House saw on the Paper that the time was 10.30, but in accordance with the Resolution passed in July, if the allotted day fell on a Friday, five o'clock was to be substituted for 10.30—they proposed to take Clauses 1 and 2. The Government's new clauses, of which there were only two, provided, as to the second of them, for the closing of public-houses at polls for Parliamentary elections, etc., which was fully discussed in Committee, and in regard to which, though he could not say they were proposals which were likely to meet with universal assent, yet they might have sympathetic consideration on the other side of the House in view of the declaration made by the Leader of the Opposition. The other new clause, that first on the Paper, raised questions which were rather questions of practical detail than of principle, and dealt with two matters with which the Government during the Committee stage promised to deal. Then there followed the new clauses proposed by private Members, some of which undoubtedly raised important points, but he should hope at any rate that no large part of the time of the first day would go to the discussion of these new clauses, because, for one reason, any such discussion would necessarily curtail the time to be given for the consideration of the first and second clauses of the Bill. As regarded Clauses 1 and 2, they had been amply discussed in Committee; three days were given to their consideration, and, he thought they might fairly add, the best part of another day, devoted to the consideration of the first Schedule, which was an appendix and could only be considered in relation to Clause 1. He came next to the second day, which they proposed to divide into two compartments, the one to close at 7.30 and the other at 10.30. That was Monday. The first matter for consideration would be Clause 3, which, as regarded the first part of the Bill, was considered in many quarters the most important of all its provisions. That clause was fully debated in Committee, but of course there ought to be a further opportunity for discussion, inasmuch as they had put down a proviso—a concession, it was described as in some quarters—which he said in the debate in Committee the Government were willing to make, by which an extra seven years was given at the expiration of the reduction period of fourteen years before the State would resume the monopoly value of old licences. That the Government regarded as a matter of very great importance, and that the House ought to have time to consider. The Amendments which the Government proposed to make in Clause 4, which followed in the first compartment of the second day, were purely drafting Amendments. The second compartment embraced Clauses 5 to 9, and they had put down Clause 5 advisedly as the first matter to be considered in that second compartment, because, as the House would see, if they looked at the Amendments on the Paper, it would raise the question of the position of off-licences after the end of the reduction period. Clauses 6, 7 and 8 were administrative clauses, and the only Amendments which the Government proposed were some drafting Amendments, and raised points not on Clause 7 but on Clause 9 as to Welsh local option, which had been fully discussed. They came to the third day, which included Clauses 10 to 17. They rightly began the third day with Clause 10, which was an extremely important clause, and the Amendments which the Government had put down on the Paper to that clause raised the question of the value to be placed, in assessing the compensation annuity, on the concession of the further seven years period which they proposed to give on Clause 3. As regarded the remainder of the clauses in that bundle, Clause 14 raised the question of the constitution and functions of the Licensing Commission, which were very fully discussed during the Committee stage. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh," and "Never."]

*MR. G. D. FABER (York): The policy of the Commission was never discussed. We were told we must wait for the clause, and the clause was never reached.

MR. ASQUITH said his recollection did not tally with that of the hon. Gentleman. He thought every aspect of the Commission, its functions and composition, was discussed in a most exhaustive way. Clauses 15 to 17 made purely administrative changes, and he did not believe, as far as he could judge, that there was any very serious opposition to the proposals which they contained. Coming to the fourth day, the first part of Clause 18 (the Sunday Closing Clause) had been very fully discussed. Clause 19, which was not discussed at all in Committee, the Government thought a very important clause, dealing with the children and it was right that the House should have an opportunity of reconsidering it on Report. On the fourth day they dealt with Clauses 20 to 23. Clause 20, which enumerated the conditions which justices might attach to the renewal of licences, was a very important clause, and certainly ought to take the first place in any compartment allocated for the Report stage. The Government had put down an Amendment so as to allow the justices, in view of the special circumstances of particular localities, the power to prevent drink being sold before eight o'clock in the morning. Clauses 21 to 23 were unimportant. The fifth and last day they proposed to divide into two compartments. The subject of discussion in the first compartment began with Clause 24, a very important clause, dealing with monopoly value. Inasmuch as there was no opportunity for discussing this clause in Committee, the Government thought the House was entitled to take it first for discussion on the Report stage. As regarded the remaining portion of this bundle, Clauses 25 to 35 were of minor importance, and to a great many of them no Amendments of any kind were put down; and from general experience it might be assumed that no real objection was taken if no hon. Gentlemen on one side or the other put down any Amendment. The second compartment of the fifth day included the clauses on clubs, which were discussed in Committee during the whole of three days. There was no part of the Bill which had been subjected to greater consideration than that particular section. In regard to the Schedules, the first and fourth were put in front. That which had reference to passenger vessels was assented to by most of those concerned. That was the allocation which the Government proposed. They had put down the Motion after much careful consideration, with a view of carrying out the principle which he indicated in his opening remarks. But at the same time the Government were perfectly ready to listen to any suggestions which would, in the opinion of any considerable body of Members, secure ampler discussion of matters which either were undiscussed altogether in Committee or, in consequence of the Committee discussion, acquired a novelty or an importance which they did not appear previously to possess. He would only say, in conclusion, that if they were to have compulsory closure of measures of much complexity and importance like this, the precedent which the Government were setting of reserving the allocation of time for the purposes of Report until the conclusion of the Committee stage, was a most useful precedent, because it would prevent what had undoubtedly happened in days gone by—what happened certainly in regard to the Licensing Act, 1904—that particular provisions of the Bill were passed by that House without there being an opportunity for consideration either on the Committee or the Report stage. He begged to move.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the proceedings on each of the five allotted days given to the Report stage of the Licensing Bill shall be those shown in the second column of the following table, and those proceedings shall, if not previously brought to a conclusion, be brought to a conclusion at the time shown in the third column of that table—

TABLE.

REPORT STAGE.

Allotted Day.	Proceedings.	Time for Proceedings to be brought to a Conclusion.
First - -	New Clauses and Clauses 1 and 2 - -	10.30
Second - -	Clauses 3 and 4 - - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 5 to 9 - - - - - -	10.30
Third - -	Clauses 10 to 17 - . - - -	10.30
Fourth - -	Clauses 18 and 19 - - - - -	7.30
	Clauses 20 to 23 - - - - -	10.30
Fifth - -	Clauses 24 to 35 - - - - -	7.30
	Clause 36 to the end of the Bill, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion - - - - -	10.30

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he certainly did not rise to make any attack upon this particular allocation of time. The real matter of which they complained was that the right hon Gentleman should allow only five days for dealing with matters which every man, he did not care to which party he belonged, knew perfectly well had never been discussed at all in the earlier stages of their debates. He was, he confessed, disappointed with a phrase which fell from the right hon. Gentleman in the closing words of his speech, for he seemed to consider that the methods adopted for dealing with this Bill were likely to be perpetually adopted when any complicated measure of this kind was brought forward. With all the experience of the ten closures by compartment for which in three years the Government had been responsible, absolutely the only improvement which had suggested itself to the inventive mind of the Government was that they should, having allocated blindly at the beginning of their closure by compartments a certain fixed time for dealing with Report, manipulate that brief time in the interests of discussion. He thought it was, perhaps, better that they should have the Report stage dealt with by compartments than that they should have it confined to a very narrow space of time without compartments. He did not quarrel with that. But to suppose that this alteration, namely, closure by compartments, was anything in the nature of a reform of Parliamentary procedure was really absurd. It might be the faintest and most insignificant palliation of a great and growing evil, but more than that it certainly was not. They had only to listen to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to learn that nothing he was proposing to-day did away with the original vice of the arrangement to which the Government committed itself last July. They suffered now, and, whatever arrangement was made, they must suffer now under the plan which the Government had adopted, and so far as that part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech was concerned, he only regretted that there was no hint or suggestion that he had in his mind some better method of dealing with complicated Bills than the rough-and-ready methods which his predecessors did adopt occasionally, but which he and his friends had made an habitual, chronic, almost invariable practice, and to which he apparently looked forward with serenity in the long vista of the future history of Parliament. He thought that was a very unhappy state of things, and he was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman could not even by a phrase or a parenthesis indicate that he hoped something better would occur in the future than a repetition of that policy, which had produced such unhappy consequences in the past. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that there were forty-seven clauses of this Bill, of which a very large number had not been discussed, but of that large number a great many had not been divided against, and, therefore, he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that because those clauses had not been divided against, they had been considered not worthy of discussion and were unopposed. The right hon. Gentleman after all was an old Parliamentary hand, and he must know perfectly well that clauses, though they might contain some pernicious details, were passed over because they had not time to discuss or comment upon them, and were only allowed to vote Aye or No. That put them in an extremely difficult position. A Member was naturally very unwilling to commit himself wholly in opposition to a clause with much of which he might happen to agree. It was really inconceivable that the Government should suppose that unless a section of the House was prepared to vote against a clause standing part of the Bill, that such clause was not worthy of commentary, discussion, or amendment. It was an entirely novel doctrine to be laid down by any Government in that House, and it was one utterly subversive of Parliamentary discussion in Committee of the Whole House. Such a position was wholly untenable. It did nothing to mitigate their objection to a Bill, which was so arranged as to raise previous issues connected with social reform, and the largest issues connected with the title of individual citizens in their own property—a Bill which raised those two groups of questions in a most aggravated and acute form, and a Bill 88 per cent. of which had been absolutely untouched and undiscussed in Committee, only 179 lines out of 988 having been discussed at all in that stage. So to treat a measure was really to turn discussion in the House into an absolute travesty. The acquiescence of the Government in it, and the absence from the right hon. Gentleman's speech of any suggestion in regard to this deplorable method of carrying on Parliamentary business, he confessed filled him with gloomy apprehension for the future of that House. The right hon. Gentleman must know that they had never had a chance of discussing the question of off-licences nor of the addition to the fourteen years which he represented as a concession to the licensing trade, but which seemed to them, so far as he understood the matter, not to be a concession at all. They had never had the Government policy explained of why off-licences were not to be subjected to local veto and why on-licences were to be so subjected, and he could not see that the right hon. Gentleman meant them to have any opportunity in the allocation of time which he was now giving to monopoly value. For any human being in the House to think that it was decent, when they were dealing with interests so vast, to allow such important questions as monopoly value to pass untouched was to have the strangest view of what was really due to the House of Commons and its constituents. The right hon. Gentlemen had referred by comparison to the Act of 1904, which he and his friends thought pernicious at the time, but which they had adopted as the basis of some parts of the Bill. He would not go into the merits or demerits of the Act of 1904, but it was a simple measure which carried out one plain proposition, with which they might agree or from which they might dissent. It was discussed absolutely *ad nauseam*, and there was not very much to be said about its details. Simple as it was the Bill of 1904 was discussed at a length absolutely beyond comparison with the time which had been allowed for this Bill, if they took into account the comparative length of the two measures. The peculiarity of this Bill was not merely that it was a long one, but that it contained within it a number of isolated and separate changes in the law, each of which, if taken alone, would be regarded as quite as controversial a subject as any passed in the Act of 1904. There was the question of the time-limit, which could have been treated in a separate Bill. There was the question of off-licence, which also could have been treated in a separate Bill; and there was the whole question of local option, which could have been similarly treated. He mentioned only some of the subordinate measures contained within the ambit of this extraordinary scheme, and each of these, if the Government had brought them forward separately, would have required discussion on the Second Reading of the Report stages, and, as everybody knew, each of them would have taken a very large portion of Parliament's time. But simply because the Government had chosen to bind together these fragments of licensing reform, having no mutual connection or logical coherence, and cram them into the limits of one measure, they thought they were justified in saying to the House that they would only allow so much time in which to discuss them, and if five days on the Report stage were not sufficient, well then it was a great misfortune, they were very sorry, but it was not their fault. But it was their fault. It was the fault of the Government, not merely that they tried to pass too many Bills, but because they tried to put into what they called one Bill, the substance of half a dozen separate Bills. Of course, hon. Gentlemen opposite differed profoundly from the views held on his side of the House with regards to the merits of many of these proposals, but was there one of them familiar with Parliamentary proceedure in the past who did not know that in the very criticisms he was passing on His Majesty's Government, he was not in the least exaggerating the kind of task which they expected the House to perform; and if the House was unable to perform it under the old rules, which in the main governed their procedure, the fault was with those taskmasters who put before them a work which they were unable to perform, and not with the assembly which was asked to do the impossible. In the actual distribution of the time during the five days which the right hon. Gentleman was giving to Report, he personally took very little interest. It was perfectly clear that it was never intended that they should discuss this measure. In their method of conducting the business the Government exhibited, he had almost said, a malign pleasure in showing how little they considered the rights and dignity of the House, because—though they had many months for deliberation—when they had Government Amendments to be discussed on a particular evening, the printed Amendments appeared on the Paper only on that evening. He did not know whether they were going to do the same on Report. How many Amendments other than those on the Paper were the Government going to bring forward? Was the Solicitor-General, on whom so much of the burden of the discussion of this Bill had fallen, as the unfortunate slave of the powers which he was unable to control, going to ask them to deal for the first time on one of those evenings with an Amendment which they had never seen, and which, no doubt, the hon. and learned Gentleman had never seen, but which he was put up to move? Was that other victim of unhappy fate, the the First Commissioner of Works, going to come down some day on the Report stage and explain a new clause which turned out in the opinion of the Government to mean something quite different from what it meant according to its grammatical structure? This had been their infelicitous experience. A great amount of Parliamentary time would have had to be given to this Bill, which as a matter of fact, was unnecessarily large and cumbersome. Of course, they should have opposed the fundamental and essential principle, because they differed from it, as they thought they had shown reason for differing from it. But that could have been discussed within the time allotted to them, if the Government had not insisted, not only upon the central principle, but upon all sorts of subsidiary matters which they regarded as great questions of licensing reform, all of which required discussion, and none of which had received it —[" Oh."] —Well, very few of which had received it. Whatever was the division between the two sides of the House on the actual merits of many of the Government proposals, he believed he was talking to an absolutely sympathetic audience when he said that, dealing with an immense subject, touching the interests of every working-man in the country outside those who habitually used public-houses, raising the most violent feelings of hostility and prejudice touching the main subjects of social reform, there was not a Member who did not know well that he was not exaggerating in the least when he said that a measure of this magnitude to be passed through the House in the manner in which the Government had tried to pass it through, and were still going to try to pass it through, was not merely to deal another blow at the liberty of discussion, which, though in a diminishing degree, they had enjoyed up to the present time, but it was to send the Bill from the House of Commons for discussion in the country without the *imprimatur* of that House upon it, and without anything behind it in the shape of argument, discussion, or criticism which should commend it to the great mass of their fellow-countrymen.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said the right hon. Gentleman had complained that the Bill had not been adequately discussed. He thought the fault lay largely on the shoulders of the right hon. Gentleman himself and his friends. The Bill in its details had been deliberately boycotted. If, as he said, it was based largely on the 1904 Act, did it not show there could not be the same necessity for dealing with the points taken from that Act? He objected to the leading features of the Bill, but he realised that there was going to be a Bill and he believed there was going to be an Act of Parliament, and it was essential to try and contemplate the details of the measure, and see to what extent they could be improved and brought down to the position of practical business. He had never doubted that the Government had made very great concessions, but he was of opinion that the concessions could be still further improved, and that they could be moulded into a shape which he believed would render it more advantageous generally to have a Bill than not to have one. He thought the allocation might be advantageously altered. There had been points of uncertainty in connection with the discussion. It was obvious that in a great measure like this some features in the hurry might be overlooked, and he thought there were two or three groups of subjects which had not been sufficiently discussed. It would be an extremely desirable thing to discuss further the question of the compensation to public-house tenants. He recognised that the Government had gone a very great way towards protecting the interests of the public-house tenants, and that they would be in a better position after the Bill became law than ever before, but further discussion was necessary in order to elaborate and round off some of these points. The extension of the time-limit to twenty-one years had left a doubt in people's minds because he did not understand now the exact arrangement of the three years compensation and other points of that description which he thought might be dealt with at greater length. He put it to the Prime Minister whether it would not be possible in connection with the time-limit to take off this clog of local option. They had not got local option with the off-licences, but it was on these on-licences, and it clogged the whole position. It got rid of the security. It did not enable the people to insure themselves against these risks, and it was acknowledged in every part of the House that the two-thirds majority on local option was not likely ever to be effective or to be put into operation, at any rate in the greater part of England. He should like to have further time on the matter of compensation, which had not been very largely discussed. It appeared to him that if there was not to be a limitation upon the levy to be charged equally, if there was a doubt about that, there ought not to be a limitation upon the method of compensation.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now discussing some future Amendments to the Bill. He cannot do that at this stage. He must wait until the opportunity arises.

*Mr. BARNARD said there were many reasons why, in his judgment, further time should have been allocated for the consideration of the important clauses and Amendments, because in that way they were more likely to produce a Bill which might be workable than otherwise. He had occupied rather a difficult position during the debates. After the Prime Minister had made the concession of the seven years he had explained that that was a position which ought to be contemplated and weighed up, and that was where he parted with Members of the Opposition. In his judgment it ought to be contemplated in detail. They thought it ought to be dealt with solely in the manner in which they had chosen to deal with it. After his speech, in which he said this thing should be looked into in detail, he had got into a terrible tangle. The trade papers proceeded to say he was ratting, and all the rest of it, and there was a quarrel amongst the interested parties inside his own constituency. The licensed victuallers met, and passed a resolution unknown to him—it was published in all the Birmingham papers—in which they said they were of opinion that he had been perfectly right in fighting one by one, to the best of his ability, these Amendments. If hon. Members above the gangway were so positive in not going into the details of the measure—if they were perfectly certain that the publicans of England were with them—all he could say was that he was not. He could hope that the earlier days might be rather extended and the later ones cut out.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) said he did not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman. He should certainly be out of order if he did so. But if the hon. Member had taken the trouble to look into the number of times he had spoken in Committee, he did not think he would bring the accusation of obstruction against the Opposition. The Prime Minister had stated that twelve of the clauses which were undiscussed were non-controversial, and therefore unimportant. That threw a very lurid searchlight on the attitude the Government took up on the time they considered necessary to allocate to the discussion of each clause. Apparently the right hon. Gentleman thought that because a clause was non-controversial it was unimportant. That was the effect of his words. They were to understand that when clauses were controversial, when fierce party passions were aroused, and when words were bandied across the floor of the House, the Government thought it necessary and important that the clauses should be discussed, and when they had clauses equally important containing matters of detail, because they were not controversial, the Government thought it was not necessary to discuss them. When the Prime Minister held these views it was obviously a mere waste of time to discuss the details of the allocation. He was pleased that for the first time when they had discussed guillotine Resolutions they had not heard the hoary old fiction trotted out that the guillotine Resolutions were rendered necessary by the obstructive tactics of the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted frankly, not merely that, owing to the Resolution passed in July, his hands were more or less tied, but that in a controversial Bill of this kind it was necessary to tie down the House to prevent a great many clauses being discussed, for the physical reason that there was not sufficient time to discuss them. That again was a very important admission, as was also the admission that this procedure was to be widely adopted in the future. The right hon. Gentleman had one ally much more powerful than any of his colleagues —the clock. That was the General Blucher who never failed him, and was always in time. If he might make a suggestion with all courtesy and seriousness and without impertinence, it was that the right hon. Gentleman having that powerful ally might well give some of his colleagues a well-earned holiday and enable them during the Report stage to give a little much-needed time to the work of their own offices.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said they did not think it in the least necessary to accept the right hon. Gentleman's invitation of suggested alterations in his scheme. The difficulty arose from the shortness of the time at the Prime Minister's disposal. It would be impossible to recast the time-table in such a way as to ensure the fair and proper discussion of many clauses which they had not had an opportunity of saying a word about in Committee and were not likely to have an opportunity of discussing on Report. The Prime Minister had laid great stress on the fact that very many clauses were allowed to pass, not only without opposition, but without any very great number of Amendments appearing on the Paper. That arose largely from the fact that they knew it was perfectly impossible to reach them. The right hon. Gentleman must not therefore consider that these clauses were thought incapable of amendment. He agreed that, so far as he had been able, the Prime Minister had redeemed his pledge of giving them an opportunity of discussing the new Amendments, but he was certain the Bill would leave the House without many of its important clauses having been discussed at all. The whole trouble arose from the fact that six or seven Bills had been crammed into one, that barnacles had been attached to the main body which it was perfectly impossible to discuss or remove, and, therefore, they must not be held, simply because they had not discussed or sought to amend the clauses, as accepting their principle.

*MR G. D. FABER said the Under-Secretary for the Home Department on 17th July last, when the setting up of the guillotine was under discussion, used the following words—

> "The hon. Member for the Ashford division of Kent suggested that there would be no time to ascertain the feeling of the House as to the manner in which the five days should be distributed. But during the long weeks in which the Bill would be under discussion there would be ample time for the Government, through the ordinary means of communication, to gather views from the various quarters of the House as to which clauses Members desire should have preference on Report. From that point of view the proposal of the Government for the new allocation on Report was not open to objection or criticism."

He had asked the right hon. Gentleman who had control over these matters as regarded their own party as to whether the whips on the Government side had approached him, and he did not gather that any such communication took place. The right hon. Gentleman ought to have carried out the undertaking, and gathered the general views of the House before the discussions for the five days were actually stereotyped. As regarded the general discussion, he felt that the matter was past praying for. The whole mischief was done when the guillotine Resolutions were originally taken, and nineteen days were allotted to Committee and five to Report—manifestly insufficient in either case. The actual allocation of the time for the discussion arising on the Report stage was relatively of minor importance. The Government could not tell in anticipation how many days would be required, and if they were going partly to reserve the guillotine with regard to the Report stage it would have been better to have reserved it altogether and decided now instead of then how many days should be given. They had not done it, and it was not much use carrying the matter further. He was sorry that in the heat of the moment he had interrupted the Prime Minister on the question of Clauses 14 to 17. Those clauses had really never been discussed as regarded the policy of the establishment of the Commission. They had discussed the number of the Commissioners, but the Chairman had held them down to that, and the question of policy was reserved until they got to the notice to omit the clause, and it was never reached.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) wished to make his humble protest against this allocation proposal. The position seemed to be utterly absurd in view of what had already taken place in Committee. Only about one-seventh of the Bill had been discussed, yet he was glad to think the Prime Minister had not accused them of obstructive mehods. He, himself, had not made a single speech. It had been left to the hon. Member for Kidderminster to accuse them of obstruction. He was entirely unjustified in his remark, and if he had totted up his speeches he would probably find he had made as many as any Member of the House. In spite of the drastic way in which the Government had forced the measure through the House, it was freely acknowledged that they had managed to get themselves into a greater muddle than any Government had ever got into in modern times on an important measure such as this. Amendment after Amendment of the most drastic character was placed in the Bill by the Government or else accepted by them. And what of the other part of the Bill which was not discussed at all ? It was clear that the Government had not given proper consideration to the measure, and they had shown their hopeless incompetence in dealing with it. When they came to the Report stage they found they were practically dealing with a more or less new Bill, utterly different from that which they had passed on the Second Reading. It was absolutely absurd to endeavour to force it through the Report stage in five days. He acknowledged that, given the small time allowed them, the right hon. Gentleman had done his best to allocate it as fairly as he could. He noticed that with the exception of one day the right hon. Gentleman intended to see that everyone got his dinner comfortably, as he had allotted only two clauses for the dinner-hour each day, with the exception of the fifth day, when they were to have eleven clauses at the dinner-hour, and he was afraid the latter part of the Bill would not receive the discussion which the Prime Minister told them it would receive. A three hours discussion for twelve clauses and the Schedules appeared to be absolutely absurd. One could not help feeling thankful that the Bill after it left the House would go to another place where it would receive that fair and proper discussion which it merited. The country had come to see that it was not the House of Commons which gave fair consideration to any measure, but the House of Lords, and the country was looking to the House of Lords to do something drastic with the measure.

MR. ASQUITH said he gathered from the speech of the hon. Gentleman that he thought this the most muddle-headed and incompetent Government that ever held office. It was very sad to hear that opinion, but nothing he could say which would be relevant to the question would induce the hon. Member to change it. He would not go into the general question whether or not the Government had given sufficient time for discussion ; he would simply point out that, by the time the Bill had passed through the Report stage, it would have had six full weeks devoted to its discussion. It was not easy to give a larger measure of Parliamentary time to any measure. The Leader of the Opposition had alluded to particular points of importance in regard to which he seemed to think the House was not being treated fairly. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned particularly the additional period of seven years, the monopoly value, and Clauses 3, 5, and 24. He agreed that, in view of what took place in Committee, they all presented some novel features worthy of discussion ; and it was in consequence of this that the Government had given each of those clauses the first place in one of the periods to be allotted to the Report stage. He thought that by so doing they had met the legitimate demand for an opportunity to discuss those portions of the measure. The noble Lord the Member for Horsham had spoken of turning a lurid searchlight on the policy and procedure of the Government. And what did the searchlight disclose ? That the Government had chosen for preferential discussion on the Report stage controversial portions of the Bill. What would the noble Lord have said if a preferential position had been given to clauses which passed through Committee, without any Amendments to them being placed upon the Order Paper—at least six, he believed, fell within that category—or to others upon which, when they were put from the Chair, a division was not challenged ?

He acknowledged the fair and dispassionate spirit which had characterised the discussion. Nobody liked these closure Resolutions, and, as he had often said, nobody disliked them more than he did. He would not enter into the vexed question, on which they would never come to an agreement, as to the occupants of which of the two front benches was the more responsible for the introduction of this particular form of procedure. He was glad to see that nobody had seriously questioned the fairness of the allocation of time that the Government had attempted to make between the various clauses, and he trusted that the House would now allow them to proceed to a division.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered accordingly.

PORT OF LONDON (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

*MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): In the absence of my hon. friend the Member for the Holborn division, I desire to move the Amendment that stands in his name. I think this Amendment is one of the most important that could be put down for discussion at this stage of the Bill. The Amendment alters the conditions under which the new Port of London authority is to be elected. The Government themselves, in adopting the proposal contained in the Bill, have avowed that the principle which should animate them in the creation of this new body is to have every industry connected with the port represented in the most favourable manner possible. I know that on a question of this kind in regard to practical proposals which have been put forward by the Board of Trade, with all the means of knowledge at their disposal, and which had been accepted by a Committee specially appointed to consider the subject, the House is almost bound, or at all events, is very apt to come to the conclusion that that is a subject with respect to which they ought to take the conclusion arrived at by the Board of Trade without further discussion. I think as a rule that is a good principle, but I am bound to say that so far as the constitution of this new authority is concerned this rule ought not to apply. Five years ago when a similar Bill was introduced by the late Government the Board of Trade took the view represented in the Amendment before the Committee. At that time also the Committee appointed to consider the question agreed with the proposal of the Board of Trade. They took the view that some kindof sectional representation was necessary for the separate industries so to be represented. Thus we have the Board of Trade and a strong Committee taking one view, and the late Committee taking another view. I think we may take it that this is not a subject to be settled by authority, but that it is something which the House ought to decide on its own merits. I venture to say that the arguments used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when the Second Reading of the Bill took place, when the same objection was raised which I am raising now, were arguments which, though they then convinced the House largely, were not really sound or quite applicable to the situation. His two arguments—I am speaking from memory—were these: He said it is a far simpler thing to have one register, and that it would make the Bill far simpler. The right hon. Gentleman said also that the principle of one register has been working successfully in Liverpool and Glasgow, and has had good results, and that we could not but anticipate the same results connected with the Port of London. I am sure that no one who is acquainted with the Mersey or the Clyde would say that the conditions in these ports are in the least the same as in London. So far as both of these ports are concerned all the traders are on precisely the same footing. They all pay their dues to one authority in proportion to the amount of business given, but in the Port of London the reverse of that is the case. A large part of the trade in the Port of London will be conducted under conditions entirely different from those under which the rest is conducted, and it is obvious that what may be a good system on the Clyde or the Mersey may turn out to be a very bad system so far as the Port of London is concerned, and here again we have different experiences. The conditions on the Tyne resemble those in the Port of London much more than those in Liverpool or Glasgow, and on the Tyne there is the kind of sectional representation proposed in the Amendment. Here again, therefore, we may say that so far as authority is concerned, there is as much to be said in favour of the one proposal as of the other. The other argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that we desired to get the best possible men on this new authority. Well, undoubtedly that is the main thing. If you can do that you will go a long way to make the Bill a success, and if the Bill is to have that effect I would say that that is a reason in favour of it. He said that if sections elected representatives, they would not be so likely to get the higher type of business men as if the members were all elected on one register by everybody voting at the same time. That might have something in it if it were the case that all sections would have a chance of electing those representatives. But what becomes of the argument if it can be shown, as I believe it can be, that the effect of the arrangement as it stands in the Bill will be that the Port authority will still be sectionally elected, but that unfortunately it will be entirely elected by one section. I think that is the statement that can be proved with really mathematical certainty. As the Government have framed the measure, everybody who pays dues is to vote, and they are all to be on one register, with the exception of the wharfingers, who are to vote differently. There are four different categories under which dues are to be paid; (1) payers of dock dues on ships; (2) payers of dock dues on goods; (3) payers of river dues on ships; and (4) payers of river dues on goods. I want the Committee to remember that the first two categories represent one interest. The different interests in this new Port authority will be clearly and sharply defined. They will represent in most clear and marked fashion two distinct interests. On the one hand there will be the interest of those, whether ship-owners or traders, who use the docks; and on the other hand will be those interests, whether ship-owners or traders, who do their business in the river. Not only are those interests clearly defined, but it is obvious that they can become directly hostile to each other. That will be admitted by the Board of Trade. At this moment a charge is made that the expense of the docks is one of the great drawbacks to the Port of London. It would be perfectly possible, and in a sense perfectly right, for the new authority to say that these expenses in the docks ought to be reduced and this reduction can be made in one of two ways. It can be done by increasing the volume of trade, but there is another method by which it can be effected, and that is by increasing the expense to the trade done outside. I cannot help thinking that anyone acquainted with the conditions and willing to look fairly at this subject will see that nothing could be more unfair than that one interest—that of the docks—should have complete control of the port, and that it is they, and they only, who are to decide the way in which the expense in the docks should be reduced at the expense possibly of the trade done in the river. That is precisely the position which is left by this Bill. The figures I am about to quote were given in evidence. The payers of the dock charges and of dues on goods pay £2,100,000, and the payers of port charges on shipping and dues on goods, which are the only things in which people interested in the river as distinct from the docks have any say on the new authority, pay £140,000. But only half of that belongs to those trading in the river, and therefore their interest in it is £70,000. The dues on goods amount to £180,000, and again something like a half is represented by those trading in the river. Therefore I ask those who are interested in the subject to take these figures into consideration.

*MR. RUSSELL REA (Gloucester): Where do you find these figures?

*MR. BONAR LAW: It is the estimate made by the Board of Trade before the hon. Member's Committee. This great interest which does its business in the river pays in dues and has, therefore, voting power of £160,000, while the interest which does its business in the docks pays £2,260,000. That is to say you have one register only, and if all classes vote on that register, the chance of outside trade being represented on the new authority is as £160,000 is to £2,260,000. It is perfectly obvious that under such circumstances the new Port authority, so far as elected, will consist entirely of those who represent trade in the docks. If they put up seventeen candidates to be elected, there is not the slightest chance in the world of any other interest having any elected member whatever. I do not say that that is merely a danger that may arise; I think it is a certainty. This new authority so far as elected will consist entirely of those who trade in the docks, and the other interests will be left altogether unrepresented. That is my belief, and I think it is borne out by the figures I have given. I dare say that the right hon. Gentleman will say that I have left out of account altogether the modifications introduced by the President of the Board of Trade. In the first place, the President of the Board of Trade has the right to decide what class of payments to the dock authority shall be considered as dues from the point of view of having a right to vote. It is quite possible, and I think it is probable, that the Board of Trade may say that warehouse charges should be left out, but even if they take that course, the preponderance is still so enormous on the side of the docks that it will not make any difference to that part of the trade of the river which represents in volume half the total trade of the Port of London, and whose interest in the Port of London is every bit as great as those who do their trade entirely in the docks. The next modification introduced into the Bill during its passage through Committee is a clause by which the Board of Trade is to make half of the elected members shipowners, and the other half merchants. I do not see how they are going to do that. It is an attempt at proportional representation, and I do not see how it can work. But even if it does work, that modification is based entirely on ignorance of what the real facts are in London. In other ports, the Mersey and the Tyne, if there is any difference between the various classes of payers of dues, it is the difference between those who pay dues on ships and those who pay dues on goods. But in London that is not the dividing line. It is between those who trade in the docks and those who trade in the river. If you are to have half the new authority to be represented by those who pay dues on goods, and the other half by those who pay dues on ships, you will not touch the central injustice of this proposal; and that is, that this great river interest, which represents in bulk half of the total trade of London, will be absolutely unrepresented on the new authority. The last modification made by the Board of Trade is that they reserve power, after the first election, if they find that this system is not working well, to alter the whole system on which the voting is done. Obviously that provision is for an emergency and put in to meet a difficulty if a difficulty arises, and it does make the position much less serious than if it were permanent. The figures I have given to the Committee show that you cannot possibly have a worse system from the point of view of dealing fairly with the existing interest than the system represented in this Bill, and it is surely of the greatest importance that at the outset the different interests should be fairly represented. There is another body which deserves special consideration from the Government. I mean the manufacturers on the waterside. I think they should have at least one representative specially put on the authority as constituted. Let me point out how important that is. It is a fact, I believe, that London is the greatest manufacturing city in the kingdom; but everyone knows that these manufactures are carried on under very great difficulties and disadvantages; so much so, that many industries which used to flourish here have been carried to other parts of the country. The sole advantage of manufacturers in London is the cheap method of receiving the raw materials and of sending away the finished goods. I believe this Bill will do good to London, as a whole, but I do not see how it is going to benefit the manufacturers of London. They will be placed at a disadvantage if dues are imposed on the goods used in their manufactures, and if they are made liable for dues on the export of their goods. I say that this body should have their representatives on the Port authority. The importance of that was felt so strongly that in the Bill of the late Government, though no representation was given to the manufacturers in the original Bill, Lord Cross's Committee gave them two representatives. I think in the interest of the Port authority itself, it would be a great advantage that there should be at least one man to represent those interests and to point out what would be the effect on the manufacturing industries of putting dues on the different kinds of material they use, and on their manufactures. I can quite believe that the constitution of the authority will not work out so badly as the figures I have given show; and that whatever body is appointed they will try to be moderately fair. That is true, but docks have their own interests to protect, and the river trade has its interest, and it is the interest of the dock to keep the charges on the dock down. Surely it is not right that the decision of this question should be left entirely to those who have a direct interest in deciding it in one way. I do not know whether it is too late to appeal to the Board of Trade to reconsider their decision, but I am afraid they have made up their minds about it, and that there is not much chance of carrying conviction to them. But I am certain the system is wrong, and that the Government are making a mistake in persisting in it, and I hope they will reconsider it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 22, to leave out from the word 'eighteen,' to end of subsection, and to insert the words 'nineteen. By payers of dues on ships trading to the docks, four; by payers of dues on ships trading to the river, three; by traders, five; by waterside manufacturers, two; by wharfingers, three; by owners of river craft, two.' "—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Bonar Law.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The hon. Gentleman has addressed the House at some length, but although he has given us a great many statements and arguments upon the general subject of the method of selecting a Port authority, he has devoted hardly any observations to advocating the Amendment which he has thought proper to move. The hon. Gentleman has found fault with the Government's idea of a Port authority. I wish he had shown some reason why he does not think it good; but in support of his Amendment he has moved I have not heard a single argument in favour of the particular form in which he would propose to amend and reform the constitution of the Port authority. I was not surprised at this. The hon. Gentleman has always shown some temerity in committing himself to the principle of sectional representation on these boards, as against the principle of general representation. For what is the issue before the Committee? Surely it is an exceedingly simple one. Are the members of this new Port authority to go to its meetings with the desire of representing the interests of the Port of London as a whole, or are they to go there merely to consider what would conduce to the prosperity of part of our system; are they to be merely the delegates of special sections of the community, each of whom do not consider the general interest, but the interest of the special groupings which they represent. Which of these two methods which are now before the Committee seems the most in accordance with the public interest? I submit that there can really be no doubt in anyone's mind. There was no doubt in the minds of the Committee. The traders applied to the Committee to determine this matter; they heard all the arguments which were advanced by the different sections, and they felt, having regard to the multiplicity of traders that there are in London, that the only chance of getting a really clear and powerful policy from the Port authority is to avoid sectional representation altogether. The hardship which the hon. Gentleman has dwelt upon, of particular sections possibly not finding their representation, is not so great as is commonly supposed, because as a matter of fact all traders, shipowners, and wharfingers in the river have interests which are largely interdependent and will prosper as the prosperity of the port advances and will suffer in proportion as that prosperity is impaired. This Amendment which we see upon the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Holborn, even this would not be representative of all sections, and if it be an attempt to give sectional representation of all classes it is a conspicuous failure. From that point of view I shall, therefore, ask the Committee not to assent to this proposal. It has been from the first the guiding principle of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to prefer the general interests to the sectional interests, and that is one of the issues of principle which we submit to the House at the very outset of these discussions. Once you begin to give sectional representation where are you to stop? Every single locality considers it is affected; every single trade—corn and timber—has come forward asking for sectional representation, and it is against all these disconnected individuals and separate interests that we are asking the Committee to prefer the large and general interests of the Port of London. In choosing this course we have the respectable precedent of the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board, where a general method of election prevails, and the new development of the dock system which has been lately brought into force upon the Clyde. Therefore, I must ask the Committee not to accept this Amendment, and I should like to say, so far as the other parts of the hon. Gentleman's speech were concerned, in which he attacked the general methods and principles by which we propose to give effect to the principle of a general Port authority, that those points will arise very suitably in regard to the numerous Amendments which have been put upon the Paper affecting that particular machinery.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I do not profess to have a very intimate knowledge of the subject, although it is one in which my constituents have very great interests, but I think the right hon. Gentleman has not very successfully answered my hon. friend. I quite agree that the question is one of great difficulty, but in the first place the right hon. Gentleman seems to suppose that my hon. friend near me had approached this question in a controversial spirit. No one who heard his speech could say so. He did not attack the Government, and I am rather surprised at the tone which the right hon. Gentleman adopted. My hon. friend's contention really was a very simple one, and it has not been disposed of by the argument of the President of the Board of Trade, though there may be other arguments, and if so, they ought to be made to the Committee. I quite admit that the hon. Gentleman opposite, and the Joint Committee over which he presided, pronounced in favour of the scheme of the Government, but I believe the Bill of the late Government was based on the Report of the Royal Commission, which did admirable work—work upon which the whole of this legislation is founded—and Lord Cross' Committee which investigated the question, and which came to an opposite conclusion—indeed, to the conclusion which my hon. friend has embodied in his Amendment. That, at all events, shows that perfectly impartial authorities are divided on this question. What was the solitary argument of the President of the Board of Trade? He said—"We are in favour of appointing a body which is to deal in a broad spirit with the interests of the Port. We do not want to have sectional representation, under which the various members of the Port authority shall come forward, not to deal with the interests of the Port as a whole, but to deal with them in a fragmentary fashion, each of the representatives dealing only efficiently with that part of the scheme for a Port authority which affects his particular constituency." I would, of course, rather have a general representation than a sectional one, if you are going to get it by the Government Bill; but the whole of my hon. friend's point is this, that though in terms and on paper you are going to get a broad representation by the scheme of the Government, you will, in fact, get a sectional representation, with this great disadvantage, that only one section will be represented, viz., the section which deals with the docks, and not with those great interests which are involved in the use of the river outside the docks. Everybody knows that the whole difficulty, or one of the great difficulties of dealing with the Port of London, is this division of interests between those who use the river and those who use the docks. That is the fundamental and essential difficulty, and it is a very great difficulty, and I do not think you will get out of it by running a scheme of representation in which only the docks or mainly the docks will be able to have it all their own way, no matter what anybody else says, thinks, or does, and then salve your conscience by saying: "Well, we have only one register, and we have only one scheme of representation, and therefore we represent all the interests of the docks," when, in reality, the effective electors who will have it in their power to control the management of the whole Port of London will be the owners of the docks, and the owners of the docks alone. That really is the scheme of the Government. It may be one or the best solution of the almost overwhelming complexity of this problem, but I am bound to say that I do not think the President of the Board of Trade has proved that it is the best and only plan, and highly as I rate the authority of the Committee of which the two hon. Gentlemen whom I see opposite were members, who considered this question in an impartial spirit, they will forgive me if I say that I think that this all important point ought to be dealt with in a somewhat broader spirit than that exhibited by the President of the Board of Trade, and some attempt should be made to deal with the crucial difficulty laid before the Committee by my hon. friend, namely, that if you have one register, and if you confine yourself to the register in the scheme of the Bill, the result will inevitably be that interests which have to deal with half or more than half in volume of the trade of the whole Port of London may be and probably will be outvoted by those who represent a very important, but still only sectional, interest connected with the Port. It is in the interest not of a section, but of the whole Port of London that I plead for a rather more impartial consideration of my hon. friend's Amendment than the right hon. Gentleman has given it, and I trust that the hon. Gentleman who presided over that Committee or the Chancellor of the Exchequer will submit what is the policy of the Government, and give us in more detail the reasons which induced them to leave the precedent set by the Commission and Lord Cross' Committee and adopt a wholly new method. I am sure the Government will accept the assurance that neither I nor my hon. friend approach this question in a partisan spirit. I am only too anxious to see a settlement, and I recognise the tremendous difficulties which any Government would have to deal with, when they have to consider the many interests which by long practice in the Port of London have been allowed to grow up.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I fully accept the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that he does not approach this question in a party spirit and I extend the same observation to the hon. Member for Dulwich, because I remember very well the way in which when I had charge of this project, the hon. Member assisted me in the matter, and I may say that he approached the problem in a spirit of helpfulness as far as I was personally concerned when I was at the Board of Trade. I accept his assurance of the sincere spirit in which he acted, and that his observations were not directed in any partisan spirit against the action of the Government. And after all it is a difficult question, a very difficult question, to decide. I am sure that for some time I hesitated a good deal myself as to whether I should follow the precedent set by my predecessor and adhere to a sectional representation, or whether I should rather follow the precedent of the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board. All I can say is that after considering the thing very carefully, I came to the conclusion, very, very slowly, that, on the whole, the Mersey precedent was the better precedent, and I still hold that opinion. I agree that the hon. Member is perfectly right and can demonstrate from the figures the possibility of getting representation almost exclusively into the hands of one group. I do not think it is likely to operate in that way, and I think there is a good deal in what my right hon friend the President of the Board of Trade said about it—that the men who largely trade in the docks have also an interest elsewhere. It is not as if trade had purely a dock interest; here there is a river interest, and here they are interdependent, and people who do business in the docks do business in the river as well, and I am very doubtful if you can group them into the docks on the one hand and the river on the other. The Government are very anxious to avoid a mere sectional representation where you get men returned in the purest sectional interest, and I think that is a very important consideration for the first few years when the whole policy of development of the Port will have to be decided. I do not want to criticise severely the interests of the Port of London, but it seems to me that there is a greater danger in the Port of London than in almost any other port of the whole thing in the end falling into the hands of a section. In Liverpool and Glasgow you have a civic spirit, they are Glasgow men and Liverpool men, but I found when I came to deal with thePort of London that they were the wharfingers, or the Baltic, or any of the different trades, such as the corn trade, or they were great liners or short sea traders, or they were interested in barges. They fought very fiercely for the sectional interests, and I think that on the whole there is more of that spirit in the Port of London than you would be likely to meet in either Glasgow or Liverpool or on the Tyne. Therefore I think it would be very important, at any rate for the first few years, when you have to decide very important questions of policy, in fact gigantic questions of policy, such as the development of the river, whether you are going in for wharves and quays, whether you are going to extend the barrage—they are all problems of enormous importance and questions of policy to be referred practically to the first body to be elected—I think it is very important that you should get not merely men who represent the best spokesmen for the wharfingers or for the docks or on behalf of the barges, but really the most prominent men connected with the trade and the Port of London. I think by this treatment you would get the very best men. There are many prominent and suitable persons, men who command general confidence and whose interest in this matter would be a general one. By this means we shall at all events have established the *status* of the Port authority. After all, the success of this scheme will not be dependent on the ingenuity of the scheme itself, but entirely upon the class of men attracted to it. My own opinion is that you are likely to get better men by appealing to a larger constituency. For instance, if you say: "We want three wharfingers," the wharfingers will choose three men who will fight best for that particular interest. In fact, it is almost an appeal to them to do so, and I know how keenly they contest every small point in connection with their trade and very often subject the general interests of the whole to their own particular interest. Therefore I think it is of paramount importance that you should have some scheme which will attract the really big men who are connected with the trade of London and induce them to go upon this board—men who are known not merely in their trades but to everybody. I think it will be to the interests of men of the particular trades to put forward their big men and get them to serve on the board, and thus establish the *status* of the Port authority for all time. If we get small men, each representing his own particular trade on to this board, it will be hopelessly damned for ever. The board will be an inferior board, and that is not what we wish to have. The need of getting the very best men is shown in the case of Liverpool. One particular interest in Liverpool is so dominant that it could easily capture the majority of the port authority of Liverpool, but what happens is this, that the various interests electing the port authority meet together beforehand and arrange these matters. The members of the port authority are drawn from each section, but are responsible to the whole. Not only are they responsible to the whole, but they are men known to everybody both inside and outside their business. They are the big men of the trades. They are not the most clamorous or the most noisy, but they are really the best men in the trades and men who commend themselves not only to their own section but to people outside. It is most important that we should begin at any rate by getting the very best men in London for this Port authority. Supposing it turns out that our anticipation is not realised and that the prediction of the hon. Member turns out to be true, and that, after all, the whole representation gets into the hands of one group, we have not only a remedy but a warning. These men who endeavour to get the whole of the board under the control of any particular trade will know perfectly well that the Board of Trade would have to revise their rules at the next election, and with that warning before them—and even without it—I do not think business men will act in that way. For that reason I am glad that my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade has decided to stand by this clause and not to accept the Amendment.

*MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central) said he was not at all surprised at the speech which had just been delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman had a theory in favour of this Bill, and when he heard that at last the Bill had been drafted by the Board of Trade to satisfy all parties concerned he wondered by what magic wand the right hon. Gentleman had been able to accomplish it. When the Bill was before the House on a former occasion no opportunity was offered to hon. Members for honest criticism. The whole thing was rushed through. But since that time they had been able to study the Bill both inside and outside the House, and there was now as much opposition outside the House by persons interested in the Port of London as there was before. The Amendment he rose to support did not give him the opportunity at that juncture to say to what, in his opinion, was due the success of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to this Bill. But he claimed to have as good a knowledge of the river as any Member of the House. He went as an apprentice to a barge-builder in 1866 and from that period down to the present time he had seen all the attempts that the dock company had made to grapple with this problem. Moreover he was for twelve years one of the London County Council representatives on the Thames Conservancy Board. The right hon. Gentleman had made an elaborate attempt to try and avoid what would practically be the repetition of the *personnel* of the old Thames Conservancy Board, but he had not, in his judgment, made out his case. The Board of Trade seemed to be bossing the whole show so far as the Port of London was concerned. He wanted to ask the President of the Board of Trade what *he* could tell him about this river; what his nominee on the present Board knew about it, what the Admiralty knew about it, and what Trinity House knew about it except that they had a depot at Blackwall. He had always regarded these men as a drag on the wheel so far as getting practical work was concerned for the Port of London. It should be governed by a trust composed of the very men on the river whose action the right hon. Gentleman had condemned. He was taken on one occasion by the Mersey Harbour Board up and down the Mersey, and the success of the Mersey, he found, was due to the fact that the Harbour Board was composed of practical men. That was what was wanted here. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the barge-owners would select men to look after their own interests, and that the shipbuilders would do the same, as would also the wharfingers. But they would select the best men that they could get, for, the Committee might depend upon it, their living depended upon the Port of London. If the trade of the Port fell off it would not be one but all who would suffer, and that was why they would work amicably together. He was glad the right hon. Member for the City of London was not going to make this a party question. They made too many things party questions, and had lost a great deal by so doing. He was not there to champion the cause of the barge-owners, wharfingers, and shipbuilders; they were able to take care of themselves; but they brought the trade to the Port of London, and

Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the inquiry into the fish-curing industry, promised in the debate on the Home Office Vote last year, was held; and, if so, when the Report may be expected; and whether any statement with regard to it can be made before the debate on the Home Office Vote.

MR. GLADSTONE: The promised inquiry has been made by the Chief Inspector, who has investigated on the spot the conditions existing in the different branches of this widely spread industry, and his Report has been embodied by him in his General Report for 1907 just issued. The subject is a very difficult one, and will require careful consideration, and I am not in a position to make any statement with regard to it at present.

Truck in the Potteries.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the statements with regard to truck in the Potteries on pages 197, 198 of the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops; and if he will inquire of the Chairman of the Departmental Committee on Truck if the practices there referred to, involving customary payments and stoppages, are being dealt with by the Departmental Committee.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir; I am aware of the statements to which my right hon. friend refers; and I understand that the points raised have been under the consideration of the Departmental Committee on Truck.

Child Beggars.

MR. WILES (Islington, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that Frederick M'Ghee and his wife were sentenced each to one month's hard labour at the West London Police Court on Monday last on the charge of begging, and that nothing previous had been known against the couple, and that the husband had served in the late South African War, he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to reducing their sentences.

MR. GLADSTONE: I understand that the object the magistrate had in view when passing sentence was to deter persons from using their children in the streets for the purpose of obtaining alms, and that he had found lighter punishments ineffective for this purpose. I am making some further inquiry, but on the information at present before me I see no ground for advising any interference with the sentences.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Would it not be better to take the children away from their parents in these cases?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am considering that.

Hamstead Colliery Disaster—Rewards for Bravery.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now in a position to state to the House that he is prepared to recognise in a sub-tantial form the brave action of those who risked and in cases lost their lives in the attempt at rescue in the Hamstead Colliery disaster.

MR. GLADSTONE: Five of the men engaged in the rescue operations have been awarded Edward medals of the first class, and one the medal of the second class. The medals were presented to the recipients by His Majesty at the investure on Tuesday last. The medal of the first class has also been awarded to the widow of John Welsby, a member of the Altofts rescue party, who lost his life in the attempt to rescue the men in the mine.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the ladies now in prison for making demonstrations against the Government are, in default of finding sureties, suffering a heavier penalty than could have been inflicted if they had actually been found guilty of sedition, in view of the fact that by the Prisons Act of 1898 a person imprisoned for sedition or seditious libel must be treated as a first-class misdemeanant; and whether, in view of this circumstance, he will recommend the transference from the second division to the first of the making the first appointments for the Port authority a representative of their interest should be placed upon it. If the Board of Trade saw its way to make such an appointment to-day and admitted its justice to-pay, surely it was a principle which was good for all time. The principle having been already admitted by the Board of Trade that the manufacturers' interest as well as the shipowners' interest should be represented, it was only fair and just to give dock representation to the ships trading on the river.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) apologised for not being present when his Amendment was called on. He regarded this matter very seriously, and hoped the Government would assist the Committee to make good this defect in the Bill. He cordially agreed with the President of the Board of Trade and the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this should not be dealt with as a party question, but that they should deal with it in the interest of the Port of London. He was struck both by the speech of the President of the Board of Trade and by that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The President of the Board of Trade said he did not see his way to accept this Amendment and put representatives of sectional interests on the Port authority, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the desire of the Government was to attract the very best possible men they could get on to the board. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the P. and O. Company, but, after all, the P. and O. Company came under the category of those who used the docks. The objection that had been urged and which lay at the bottom of this Amendment was that no sufficient protection was afforded to those who used the river as distinct from those who used the docks; that the preponderating influence the latter would have would quite overshadow the representation of those who used the river. He always thought that the object of this Bill was a general change; that the dock, harbour, and port dues of London were so excessive as to cripple trade. If that was so, then the desire of those who managed the docks, and who had this preponderating influence, would be to reduce the charges. The Bill made the authority the administrative authority for the whole Port. As to the docks, it became a trade corporation, and he was afraid the tendency would be that the dock charges would be reduced at the expense of the other interests. It was in the hope that that might be overcome that he had put this Amendment down on the Paper, and he hoped the Government would see its way to give better representation to the river interest as apart from the dock interest and would agree to the Amendment.

*MR. RUSSELL REA said that perhaps he was more closely identified with sectional representation than even the hon. Member for Dulwich. In the hon. Member's Bill there was no sectional representation. In the Bill for which he was so largely responsible in 1903 there was no sectional representation of the kind that he now advanced. The distinction as he said now was not between ships and dues, but between docks and river. In the hon. Member's Bill the whole distinction was between ships and dues, and what sectional representation was introduced into that Bill he was in part responsible for, as being a member of the Joint Committee which inserted it. Notwithstanding his sectional record, he was a supporter of the general register which was embodied in this Bill, and which was approved by the Committee. He was in favour of it on the general grounds so well stated by his right hon. friend. It would probably introduce better men—it would introduce a better spirit—but it was a very difficult question he admitted. If there were to be sectional representation, it might be necessary in the future, and, if it should prove necessary, it would come—but it was impossible to impose sectional representation logically now. It was impossible to make a scheme for sectional representation which could be defended, and which would last, and they would very probably, in making a sectional scale now, be creating vested interests which it would be very difficult to deal with later on. If they were to make a sectional Schedule it would be sure to be wrong now, because they had not the means of coming to a right conclusion. They were going to create an absolutely new constituency and they did not know what it might be. The payers of dues on goods would be a mass of unknown people, and what would be their relative weight in the new scheme? What about the revenue they would contribute? They did not know, and what their numbers would be they did not know. For instance, on the Schedule as it stood, supposing £100,000 was contributed to the revenue of the State by dues on goods, it might be contributed by one contributor such as the P. and O. Company, who would get fifty votes, or it might conceivably be contributed by 10,000 ratepayers who paid on dues who would have 10,000 votes. He stated all these things to show that the whole of the suggestions in Schedule 1 were tentative. It appeared to him that they were reserving power to adapt these things to the circumstances better by adopting the general register now. For instance, the whole thing was "subject to the provisions of this Schedule," and the provisions of the Schedule were such as this, that the Board of Trade might make new regulations as to voting power and might revise their rates if they found that one interest predominated or was over-represented. Then, of course, for the first elections they held in their hands the definition of what dues should count, and such a preponderance as the hon. Member for Dulwich suggested would certainly not be permitted. Then after the first election the whole thing might be varied, and it could not be varied altogether at the pleasure of the Board of Trade, but must be varied by Provisional Order, and would undoubtedly come to the House again. There was another security for the oppressed waterside manufacturer, or wharfinger, or other classes who were alarmed for their interests. There were in this body a very large number of appointed members, much larger than in the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and these men might be considered guardians for the general interest. They would be men selected by great Departments, chiefly by the Board of Trade, and also by the Admiralty, and they would undoubtedly consider the general and not the sectional interests. Eventually, he admitted, it was possible that they might have to give sectional representation, and if they did the means were provided. But at the present juncture it was impossible to institute a logical scheme of sectional representation, and he hoped and was confident that the general register would prove to be practicable and just.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) thought every member of the Committee would agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he said that the sole object which Parliament ought to have in laying down the principles under which the members of this new board were to be constituted ought to be to secure a body of men of the highest possible class who would not be actuated by mere selfish interests, but who would have at heart the rights and privileges of all and would be prepared to do their best in the interests of all. Of course, there was not the slightest doubt that if they could secure such a result as that everybody would be satisfied; and the only question, as he understood it, before the Committee was really this, that some Members, including those who were responsible for this Amendment, very respectfully were suggesting that perhaps these objects would not be attained quite as well under the Government scheme as under the Amendment which they proposed. Considerable reference had been made to the happy state of affairs and the great successes which they had had in connection with the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. It was undoubtedly a matter of common knowledge that at present, and also for many years past, they had enjoyed in the constitution of that body the advantage of the presence, administrative ability, and help of a number of men of the highest possible class and of the greatest respectability and position in every respect. There was no doubt that that had been a very great thing for the Port of Liverpool, and it had been a magnificent thing for the general administration of such a concern as the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. When any Government ventured to tackle a difficult problem like that of the Port of London—

the most difficult problem of this nature in the world—it was inevitable that they should turn to the constitution of a body like the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and say that if that constitution had given such success, and had resulted in such excellent and worthy and able men being elected as members of the Board, they could not go very far wrong in adopting in outline, at all events, the general principles which obtained there. But although the whole of the elected members of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board were elected by the general body of payers of dues, irrespective of any such distinctions as were suggested in this Amendment, yet it would be acknowledged, he thought, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the elected members of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, of whom he saw one honoured member sitting on the benches opposite, were, in fact, nominees of and did represent different trades. For instance, the corn trade had their representative on the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, not legally but because it had been found in practice that the corn trade ought to be represented, and although the constitution did not provide for the corn trade making any such election. yet as a matter of fact it was found that the best, wisest, and justest thing to do, and that was the way it was done. Things were so arranged in Liverpool that they had probably the very best man in the city representing any particular trade on the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. He knew comparatively little about the geography of the Thames from actual personal acquaintance, but he thought there was one very great essential difference between the conditions that obtained on the Mersey and on the Thames which seemed to him to go to the root of the whole matter. That difference was that on the Mersey practically the whole trading front on both sides of the river belonged to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and there were very few private wharves. He knew they had the docks belonging to the London & North-Western Railway, and there was also the Manchester Ship Canal, which had the use of the river, but his point was that in Liverpool all the dock front on the Liverpool side and all the front available for trade purposes for goods on both sides of the river belonged to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board and was managed by that Board. In London they had an entirely different state of affairs. In London they had a few docks which were a comparatively small proportion to the general bulk of the trade. People owned their own wharves and had spent very large sums of money indeed upon making those facilities which up to the present no public authority had ventured to undertake. It was not proposed by the Bill to give the new authority either the power or the right to take over the whole of these trading facilities.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport): But we have power in this Bill to take over the riverside premises.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he did not think that even the wildest dream of anybody associated with the Board of Trade ever suggested that this new board when it was constituted would undertake such an enormous task, within at all events any reasonable period. He thought the hon. Gentleman would admit that it was not seriously proposed in practice by this ,Bill that this newly-elected body should begin its operations by absorbing either the greater portion or really any serious portion of all those private wharves or other trading facilities on both sides of the Thames. Therefore, they were faced with the difficulty that in London they had a number of small private interests who had got quite as great an interest, if not a greater taken collectively, in the welfare and management of the Port of London as this new body would have which would only own a comparatively small portion of the trading front of the river on both sides. The problem was rendered much more difficult by that fact. In conclusion, he was bound to say that, although he listened to the arguments of the hon. Members who supported this Amendment, and although he was impressed with the difficulties, he was afraid that other interests had been overlooked which were paramount interests. One could not get away from the conviction that the majority of the elected members ought to be elected by the payers of dues promiscuously, irrespective altogether of any particular class of voters. If the majority were elected from the register made up of the payers of dues then there would be quite enough room in a minority of the total body to give every other section some reasonable representation. He thought if that could be carried out it would at all events meet his own personal views more nearly than either the proposal of the Government or the Amendment now before the Committee.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) thought the people ought to be much better represented on this Board than was proposed. It had been said that the Government claimed that their's was not a sectional proposal. If it was not then he should like to know what it was. He knew they were in a difficulty in discussing this matter at the present moment, but that was not their fault. As a matter of fact, this was the first opportunity they had hadto discuss the matter at all, and if a question like this was brought forward at the fag end of an Autumn Session it was not his fault and it was not fair to the House. The voters who were to elect these eighteen members were to be the payers of dues. The payers of dues were not the consumers, and it was the people who actually paid the money. The payers of dues might be called the pocket through which the money passed. What he would like to have seen on this and every other Board was that those who had to find the money should have the majority of the representatives on the Board. Unless they adopted that principle they did not get the consumers who had to find the money properly represented. He had found from experience that those sectional gentlemen generally went to represent their own selfish objects—he meant their own trades and businesses—and practically only attended when they wanted to do something for themselves in any particular direction; otherwise they left the business to those who represent the people. He did not say this offensively; it was only human nature after all. They had heard that this new body might have to consider the barrage system, but his impression was that they would have no money to spend and they would not be able to consider anything, after they had spent all their money in the purchase of docks. If they had a proper opportunity of sending representatives there with the object of preventing the waste of public money he could see some reason for this Amendment. He was told that they wanted to get representatives of the P. and O. Company on this Board. [AN HON. MEMBER: They do not control the docks.] He knew they were supposed to be represented in the future by the payers of dues. He could give the Committee a striking illustration of how this special selfish interest asserted itself, and he thought it would prove up to the hilt that these people did represent their own selfish interests and their particular business interests. In the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Port of London Bill which sat in 1908 there appeared the following record. He was giving this quotation because it proved up to the hilt that these specially selected gentlemen could not be depended upon to look after the public interest. Before this Joint Committee there came a question brought forward by the promoters of the Bill in the following direction—

> "In page 13, line 30, after the word 'circumstances' to insert the words 'provided a provisional order under this section shall provide for exempting from such rates goods imported for transhipment, etc."

He need not trouble the House with the whole extract. All he needed to mention was that it was a proposal to exempt some of those interests from the charge of rates and dues in the Port of London. They were told that the Committee deliberated on that. He was further told that it was moved by Mr. Russell Rea to insert after the words "goods" in the second line the words "including coal for bunkering steamers proceeding beyond the limits of the port." They deliberated on that, and, upon a vote being taken the contents were two (Sir William Bull and Mr. Russell Rea), and the non-contents were six (including Viscount Milner, Lord Dawnay, Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord Ritchie and Sir Albert Spicer.) He was glad to notice that the Members of the House of Lords voted in the right direction, and he was glad to have an opportunity of acknowledging it. He looked to see who the gentleman was who moved this exemption in the selfish interest of the bunkering industry, and he found under the heading "Our Shipping Headlights—Russell Rea, Esq., M.P. The subject of this sketch though not a shipowner, as the term is generally understood, is yet prominently identified with one important branch of the shipping business—the bunkering industry."

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I really do not see what this has got to do with the Amendment.

*Mr. MORTON said he was going to prove that when a case arose of looking after their own selfish interests it was not always noticed, and he was trying to prove by an actual illustration how little they could depend upon them. It was his own personal experience that they could never depend upon that class of men to look after the interests of the people generally. Something had been said about the difference between the Mersey and the Port of London. That was a different case altogether. Practically they might say the business of the Port of London was done nearly all outside the docks, and therefore the outside authorities ought to be better represented. This was a democratic discussion as to democratic representation upon what was going to be a very important body which would have the right to tax the food of the people and make them pay unfair charges. Consequently he should be glad to see this new body made as representative as possible to prevent this tax being put upon the food of the people, and he was very sorry indeed that such a proposal was being put forward by a free trade Liberal Government.

*Mr. RUSSELL REA said he wished to make a personal explanation. The hon. Member for Sutherland had accused him of making proposals to serve his own personal interest. He wished to say that he had no interest in the Port of London. He had no business in the Port of London; his ships never came into that port, and never could come into it. He made the proposal to which the hon. Member had referred in the interests of those who might be considered his trade rivals, and he did it in order to put those in the Port of London in the same position as he found himself in in the Ports of Liverpool and Southampton.

*Mr. MORTON said he would like to complete reading the letter——

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith) deplored the fact that this very important Bill had come forward so late in the session. An immense amount of time had been given to it. He had sat on the Committee for six weeks and had listened patiently to the whole of the proceedings, and without prejudices on one side or the other he came to the conclusion that sectional representation was practically impossible. The Committee came to that conclusion from the mass of evidence that was placed before them. He thought it would be agreed that the Committee listened very patiently to the evidence and they failed to arrive at any other conclusion. He knew that some were very much enamoured of sectional representation. They felt that certain great interests should be represented upon this body, and they leaned in that direction, but the interests of the Port of London were so numerous and there were such an enormous number of trades to be considered, many of which hon. Members of the House had not even heard of, that they came to the conclusion that nothing but a general register would deal fairly between them all. It was not only a question of tonnage but a question also of value. There was the case of diamonds that came up to the Port which were very small in bulk but represented a tremendous amount of money. He might give to the Committee one explanation of the reason why they came to the conclusion that sectional representation would not be the best. Some hon. Members had suggested that they should go back and have sectional representation, but how were they going to do that? Hon. Members who knew the way in which business was conducted knew that this Bill had either to be dropped or the Resolutions of the Committee accepted. There was no time left now to bring in the question of sectional representation, and if they admitted one particular party they were bound to admit them all. They were bound to reconsider the whole case and the moment they once more raised the question all those bodies would come up and point to the particular interest they had to represent. For that reason he intended to support the Government in this matter. It was not a party question in any way. They were all patriots and they wished to see the Port of London removed from party politics and put in a position which would make it important and useful in a way which hitherto it had never been. If they could start afresh, and have the river clear of any docks at all, the question would be an entirely different one, but that was not the position in which they were placed. They were bound to deal with the question as they found it at the present time. They had had docks since 1759. They were started at London Bridge and they had gradually gone down the river, and those docks, with their privileges and obligations, were bound to be considered as they were dealing with this question. The whole question was an immensely thorny one, and only those who had studied the matter and looked into the details could realise the immense difficulties of the case. There was the question of free water in regard to which the dock companies were bound to allow lighters to enter their docks day and night. They were bound to open their docks and allow them to go alongside of ships in the docks so as to unload their cargoes into the ships and to allow ships to unload their cargoes into the lighters. There were the interests also of two classes of wharfingers to be considered, namely, the wharfingers who owned wharfs and houses to receive other persons' goods, and those who owned wharfs and houses for their own use. Therefore it appeared to him that a general register where those different interests were intermixed was the most satisfactory. They had considered various other suggestions, but he had come to the conclusion, with a long knowledge of the river, that a general register was the only practical solution if this Bill was to go through in 1908.

*SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central) said he only desired to put one point before the Committee which had not been made hitherto. The Committee should remember that the first Port authority was to be appointed by the Board of Trade. It would have been impossible to have formed a register sufficiently accurate to enable the new authority to be elected on that register, and therefore the Bill provided that the Board of Trade should nominate the first Port authority. Of course, on this appointment, speaking broadly, almost the future Port of London depended. It would be much more satisfactory to leave the Board of Trade a free hand in the choice of the members for the first Port authority than to bind them by saying that certain sections were to be represented in a certain way.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said the Government proposals were far and away the best. It appeared to him that the principle which dominated the Mersey Board and the Boards of the Tyne and the Clyde, namely, that those who paid the money were to be in the majority, was the right principle and the one which ought to be accepted. If that was so, the question was how the best eighteen were to be selected. They had had four or five members of the Thames Conservancy speaking there today. He took a totally different view from the hon. Member for Finsbury. It appeared to him that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wrapped it up in extremely pleasant terms when he said that the experience of sectional representation had been by no means a happy or successful one. He happened to be the only member of the Thames Conservancy who did not represent any of those sectional interests, because he was there to deal with the purity of water alone, and therefore he had been able to watch and see what had been going on, and his observations brought him to the conclusion that the present deadlock, which he hoped this Bill would get rid of quickly, had largely arisen from members of the Conservancy perfectly openly and frankly, and from their point of view perfectly properly, advancing and always pushing forward the sectional interests they were sent there to represent. He was certain that it had not been a success, and he believed that the future of the Port depended largely, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, on being able to induce the best and most distinguished men to join the new body. If they could do that they would have men who would be trusted, and he therefore welcomed the proposals of the Board of Trade because he assumed that they would pick the men who believed in what the Bill sought to put into effect. If they did that they would get over the difficulty, and perhaps make the Port of London what it ought to have been before this time.

Mr. BONAR LAW: Perhaps as I moved the Amendment I may be allowed to say a few words. I am obliged to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for his reference to my attitude on this matter, which is not a party one. I am sure that my hon. friend did not imply that I was acting in that spirit. I am glad that my hon. friend has taken a different line from mine because it shows that we are not taking a party line. I would like to refer to the arguments used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in favour of this proposal as it stands in the Bill. In doing so, I admit that if the premise on which the right hon. Gentleman starts is correct, that his proposal is going to get the best men for the purpose, there is nothing more to be said. That is the object we all have in view. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman—it was my experience when Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade—that there is not the same civic spirit in London as in Liverpool and Glasgow, but that is owing to the size of London more than anything else. People do not know each other in the same way as in other towns, and when he says that there are outstanding men in the different trades, all I can say is that that is directly contrary to what I was told by London business men. They all said that it was extraordinary how little men knew of each other.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: What I said was that all those men trading in the river were known to each other.

Mr. Barnard.

Mr. BONAR LAW: There may be one or two interests in which that is true, but the same thing does not apply all round. You will not get in London as in Liverpool or Glasgow seventeen or eighteen gentlemen who will be so outstanding as to be known to the people who would give their votes. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, after pointing out how sectional London was, said that the whole authority should be composed of one section. The whole question in dispute between the right hon. Gentleman and myself is whether or not by the Government arrangement the authority was not made as sectional as in my Amendment, with the exception that the whole power was left in one section instead of being spread over the others.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In Part IV., at page 52, of the Bill it is provided that—

> "The regulations may provide that (subject to duly qualified candidates presenting themselves) the elected members shall include as nearly as may be an equal number of persons whose principal business is or has been mainly connected with vessels and persons whose principal business is or has been mainly connected with goods."

Mr. BONAR LAW: I was going to refer to that as showing that the principle of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had broken down. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that this was the principle on which he framed the Bill. There was only to be one register because in that way you would get the best men. Since the right hon. Gentleman left the Board of Trade that principle has been abandoned absolutely. [An Hon. Member: No.] I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon; it has. The Bill as framed says that they are not to be chosen from the best men, but half of them are to consist of shipowners. Probably the right hon. Gentleman is not aware that that is in the Bill.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Power is given to the Board of Trade to prevent any distortion in the proportions.

Mr. BONAR LAW: If the right hon. Gentleman will read the evidence given before the Committee he will find a distinct undertaking that that is going to be done. I only refer to that because I say it proves that the principle of the right hon. Gentleman has broken down. You cannot hope to get one register which will fairly represent all trades. I would like to refer to what I think was a mistake made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech. He said that the two questions of a general register and of sectional representation had not been considered. But the hon. Gentleman who was a member of both Committees had pointed out that was entirely wrong. It was not paternal partiality that made him prefer sectional representation. As a matter of fact, the late Government had very little of this sectional representation, but Lord Cross's Committee recommended sectional representation, and the arguments were so powerful that they convinced the Board of Trade at that time, and I remain convinced that it is the only fair way of dealing with this question. I am not going to take up the time of the Committee any longer. I admit that it is a question on which there is room for great difference of opinion, but my whole case is that I think the question is very important, and one on which the Members of the Committee should judge for themselves and not treat it as a party question at all. The question really is—Can you possibly hope to get a fair authority on the principle which gives absolute power, in any way you like to arrange the votes, to one section of trade in London although that section in bulk does not represent much more than one trade? Should you not make sure at the outset that other interests will be represented?

SIR H. KEARLEY: The hon. Gentleman will remember that the previous Government in their Bill accorded representation to all sections of trade in the Port of London, and I think we might almost say that that acted as a considerable warning to us. What happened to the Bill? It went into Committee with a small sectional representation in it; it emerged from Committee with sectional representation written large all over it. That is the reason which induced us to keep clear of sectional representation, because once you admit it, it becomes divided and sub-divided again and again, and a number of separate traders make claims for special representation. Therefore we have thought in the best interests of the Bill that the best method to adopt in order to get the best men is to disregard sectional representation altogether. The question is an extremely complex one, as is admitted on all sides, and one on which views may change from time to time. The views of the late Government changed. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Dulwich admitted that he was a strong convert at one time to our point of view. He has changed again, and nobody can object to that. My hon. friend who was Chairman of the Committee upstairs pleaded guilty that it was mainly through his instrumentality that sectional representation was provided in 1903; and now he and other Members of the Committee have become converts to our view after having heard the whole of the evidence. The object we have in view is that of everybody interested in the Port of London, viz., to induce a far better class of men to join the Port authority—men more representative of London than of sectional interests. The hon. Gentleman, following the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, regretted that civic patriotism was not more strongly developed in London. I am certain that you cannot adopt a worse method of securing for the new Port authority the most desirable class of men than that of sectional representation. It would not be in the general interest of the Port as a whole, because the men would be there as mere delegates of sectional trades. It is because the Government hold that view that we adhere to the proposal that sectional representation should not obtain in the Bill. We say frankly that we have been very much influenced in the course we have taken by the example of Liverpool. Although the hon. Member for Liverpool says that there is an adjustment of the proportion of the representation of the various trades on the Mersey, still it is well-known in Liverpool that if a man comes on to that Board nominated by the corn trade and during his term of office shows his influence is exclusively exercised on behalf of the corn trade, when he comes up for re-election as a member of the Board the public spirit in Liverpool is so strong that he never gets re-elected. So that, although it is perfectly easy to argue that sectional representation obtains in Liverpool, it is free from the conditions to which we object, and acts in the general interests of the port, and not in the interests of a particular trade. As there are other important matters to be considered I appeal to the House to come to a decision on this question so as to proceed to other parts of the Bill.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) said he was sorry he could not accede to the desire of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, because he, like others, had to discuss this question on the only opportunity given to those who represented the river. He had listened to the whole of the debate and was very much interested in the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade and his strong expression of opinion as compared with that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to sectional representation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that this was a very open question and that there was a good deal to be said on both sides, but the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade talked of sectional representation as being a pernicious principle. He (Mr. Rowlands) said distinctly that he thought the Amendment would give them the best representation on the Port authority—much better than that in the Bill. So far as the Bill itself was concerned it was in his opinion based on sectional representation, and that being conceded some concession ought to be made to the various interests involved in the river. They had been told about Liverpool by those who knew it and their arguments had not been answered by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. If they gave sectional representation to one interest they should have sectional representation of all the industries. There were two great industries represented on the Mersey Board—the cotton trade and the corn trade.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Although these members represent particular interests they are not responsible to a particular sectional constituency, but are responsible to the whole general body.

Sir H. Kearley.

Mr. ROWLANDS said he admitted that. There was nothing in the constitution of the Mersey Board giving representative powers to these particular interests, but the authority of the port had to go outside the constitution and accept sectional representation and concede it to the two great interests on the river. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade had said that if these gentlemen were so exclusively exercised with their own affairs they were thrown out at the next election. He agreed, but supposing they were able to get the whole of the interests, including the manufacturers on the Thames, on the new Port authority, it would not happen that these representatives would be only present at the meetings of the authority when some interest of their own was to be debated. Hon. Members talked about great men of genius coming forward from the shipping interest, but there were great manufacturing interests on the Thames. He held in his hand a list of the manufacturing firms on the river, including some of the biggest and best known firms in the country. Take the Wall Papers Association, which spent hundreds of thousands of pounds every year in wages, and employed thousands of hands. Were their interests sectional? If they selected a representative would he not be a gentleman of equal capacity with the representative of the shipping interest? He maintained that these big manufacturing interests could not afford to send a man on to the Port authority who was not expert, intelligent, and could not grasp the whole affairs of the Port. He held that this question was one that could be best met by having all the interests represented on the Port authority. He joined in the view that this was not a party question, because they all spoke in the interest of the well-being of the huge population that depended on the Port authority.

Mr. REMNANT asked how the President of the Board of Trade could reconcile his statement that this was not a sectional representation when on page 52 of the Bill there was a provision as to the election of representative members which distinctly said that—

"The Board of Trade shall have regard to the desirability of elections being so conducted,

. . as to secure that so far as possible the several interests concerned shall be adequately represented on the Port Authority."

MR. CHURCHILL: The authority of the Board of Trade shall only be used to prevent exceptional representation or an undue balance or disproportion of interests being represented. There is no analogy between that and the proposal of the hon. Gentleman to construct a series of sectional constituencies.

MR. ROWLANDS said he only quoted the Wall Papers Association as one of the biggest industries established on the river.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think it is quite clear that there would be no objection to the authority, when constituted, having something like the natural evolution that followed in Liverpool. It would make sectional representation, but without the members who represented the sectional interests losing their responsibility to the general body.

*MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton) said he was sorry to detain the House, but there was one point and a most important point which arose out of this controversy, which had not been covered in the debate. As he understood the proposal of the hon. Member for Dulwich, it was that because the river trade constituted one-half of the total trade of London, that trade should be entitled to representation on the Port authority to the extent of something like 50 per cent. As far as he could analyse the figures of the Amendment, that would be the effect of it. Might he also point out that if the figures of the hon. Member for Essex were agreed to, they would then have this state of affairs prevailing, that those in London who were the users of the docks were to provide an estimated revenue of £2,100,000 to the new Port authority and docks, and would be receiving the same voting powers as those other individuals representing the river trade who only provided £300,000. He would like to say, thus early in the Committee stage of the Bill, that if the Government were for one moment to adopt an attitude of that kind it would meet with the most strenuous opposition from those who were prepared, at that moment, subject to reasonable Amendments, to accept the Bill. They felt that the burden put upon the commercial interests of London, the traders of London, was already sufficiently heavy, and that there was a very large element of risk of enormous damage being done to the interests of the port if the burden proved greater than was estimated. The payers of the new dues were in a somewhat perilous position, owing to possible extravagance and waste of money by the new Port authority, and they felt that their only safeguard from such a state of things was the possession of the franchise on a satisfactory basis. If, therefore, the Government were to adopt this Amendment or any other Amendment by which the franchise given to those who had to provide the money was illusory or fictitious rather than genuine and actual, he and others now supporting the Bill would strenuously oppose it. He was glad that the Government had taken this stand and he hoped they would not depart from it.

Amendment negatived.

*COLONEL WARDE (Kent, Medway), in moving to substitute "eleven" for "ten," said he had put down the Amendment in the interests of the County of Kent, and he could assure the President of the Board of Trade that there was nothing sectional in the proposal to give the Kent County Council one member on the Port authority. On the contrary he quite agreed, if he might be permitted to say so, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the constituencies from which the representatives of the Port authority were elected should be very wide ones; he contended that the County of Kent would be a very wide constituency indeed, and he hoped the President of the Board of Trade would allow that there were very urgent reasons why the board should be enlarged as he proposed. The County of Kent included nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants, and its chief centres of industry were located on the river littoral within the seaward boundaries of the Port authority. The towns of Erith, Dartford, and Gravesend alone included nearly 80,000 inhabitants, most of whom got their living either as owners of, or workers in, wharves and works connected with the county, and yet, notwithstanding the vital importance the river was to the county, it was, according to the Bill as it at present stood, to have no representation on the board. He might remind the right hon. Gentleman that under the Thames Conservancy Act of 1894 the Kent County Council had representation on that body, and indeed that the Royal Commission of 1900 appointed to inquire into the administration of the Port of London recommended that the Kent County Council should have representation on the new port authority. Under the Bill the boundaries of the Port of London were extended much lower down the river; therefore, seeing it was considered just that the county should have representation when a much smaller portion of its river littoral was affected, it was much more necessary now that the representation should be continued if not increased. It was all very well to say that the general body of the Port authority would naturally safeguard the interests of the county, but those interests might sometimes clash, and he need only refer to the question of sewage disposal to demonstrate that contention. The North river boundary of Kent included fisheries, oyster-beds, and places of pleasure resort. Any outfall that might be quite sufficient for the purposes of London might be wholly insufficient to protect either the health or the attractiveness of those places. Indeed, the lower part of the river had already been much polluted. Unless the pleasure resorts of the county were to run the risk of being much damaged their interests could assuredly only be properly safeguarded by local representation. But there was another consideration of much more far-reaching importance than even the health of the river littoral. He alluded to the safety of the river banks, and it seemed to him an extraordinary omission that when a Bill of this vast importance was being prepared no more efficient powers of control over the river walls were asked for than those which at present obtained. At present, so far as he could ascertain, there was no central authority responsible for the safety of the river walls. They were maintained partly by specially appointed Commissioners and partly by private owners. The dredging operations might seriously affect the safety of the foundations of these walls. Possibly not many members of the Committee could remember the disastrous explosion that occurred at Erith some forty years ago, which caused such a rent in the river wall that, had it not been for the prompt and courageous action of the military authorities at Woolwich, it was represented by the engineers on the spot that the whole country from Erith up to Camberwell might have been inundated and many thousands of lives lost in addition to the then new outfall sewers being all blown up. It might be argued that this danger, being a general one and not of local concern only, the board as a body might be interested in the question; but as Kent would primarily suffer it would be of vital consequence to the locality that local representatives should be held responsible for this important local consideration. It might be said that these questions were dealt with by the Joint Committee upstairs; but so far as the interests of Kent were concerned, he was informed that the county council went to considerable expense in retaining counsel and collecting evidence in order to be heard before the Committee with a view of enlarging the port authority as he suggested, but the Committee ruthlessly put aside its claim, and its application to be heard was refused. He therefore pressed their claim on this occasion, and begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the word 'ten,' and insert the word 'eleven.'"—(*Colonel Warde.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'ten' stand part of the clause."

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.), on a point of order, asked if the Chairman would make it clear that other Amendments would be permitted. There were several Amendments, and some of them were not interested in this particular Amendment, but they might be in those which increased the number to twelve or fourteen. Or, perhaps, the whole subject might be discussed and the debate not confined to this particular proposal.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he could not save Amendments but what could be done, and this was what the right hon. Gentleman wanted, was that the whole subject could be discussed. Other Members might desire to leave out "ten" for different reasons but there might be a combination of interests in favour of leaving out "ten" in order that some other figure might be inserted. Therefore the whole question could be discussed.

MR. CHURCHILL: This is the first of a series of Amendments proposing to give representation to various counties and cities which are, of course, affected by the operation or possible operation of the new Port authority, and I am quite sure that many will feel that the hon. and gallant Gentleman made out a very good case for the representation of the County of Kent. The difficulty the Government is in is that, no doubt, an equally good case can be made out by Members representing Essex, Middlesex, Surrey, and West Ham. Here already are a long series of Amendments, each of which would add a local representative to the Port authority. The case presented in every one of these cases is good if one had to consider only the one isolated case, but if you are to place five or six local members on the port authority to represent particular districts affected by its operation you will impair and paralyze to a very large extent the work of that authority. You will make its numbers larger than would be consistent with the swift discharge of public business and destroy the whole compact and manageable nature of the Board which it is now proposed to create. Therefore I ask hon. Members to exercise a self-denying ordinance in respect of what they might reasonably ask in the share of the representation. All these things were brought forward before the Joint Committee and urged with very great force, but the Committee was opposed to adding representatives for Kent, Essex, and West Ham, as they thought that it would be impracticable to do that and retain the compact and manageable character of the Board. In fact the Committee went so far as to say that the number appointed under the Bill was rather excessive than otherwise, that there were ten appointed members and eighteen elective members, and that that was as high as we ought to go. There can be no just ground for picking and choosing between the counties asking for representation. What is good for one is good for all, and I can only add that if representatives were appointed for each of these counties, I am sure the efficiency of the Port authority would be prejudicially affected. It would be unwieldy and have upon it an unduly large element not directly concerned with the work of making the Port of London a first class port. I therefore most strongly urge the Committee to support the proposal in the form in which it has been put before them, and to keep the Committee small. The duties which will be put upon the Port authority will be various and important, and some will be of the most supreme importance. We are going to set up a public, or quasi-public, authority which is to succeed private bodies and come forward in the general interests. Let it have a chance. Let it be a thoroughly workable and manageable body, so that this great step forward may meet with the success that it deserves.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that as the representative of one of the counties alluded to by the President of the Board of Trade, he wished to point out to him that what he had said was not consistent with what he had done in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman gave direct representation to the London County Council. He gave the London County Council four members on the Port authority. Why did he do that, and give no representation to other county authorities interested?

MR. CHURCHILL: The London County Council have no sectional interests to protect; that is the reason why.

*MR. CAVE protested very strongly against the view that any of these counties had any sectional interests to protect. He felt more and more, so far as these counties are concerned, that the Government was not treating them fairly in this matter, and especially the President of the Board of Trade. In the Electricity Bill, a few days ago, the right hon. Gentleman put the London County Council forward not only as the representative of London, but of the whole of the home counties; and a similar course was being followed in this Bill. These counties had a large frontage to the river, all of them had docks or wharves, and all of them had banks which would be affected by the dredging which was to be done by this Port authority. He thought, therefore, that the public bodies representing these large areas ought to have representatives on this Port authority, not to bring forward sectional views, but to bring forward matters affecting public interest. Surrey had a frontage of eight miles to the river. It had wharves and banks and was affected by dredging. More than that, it had the Richmond lock, which was actually within the area of the Port of London, and which required special working. Why in the name of all that was fair and just should not that county have one member on the board? He thought anybody appointed from one of these county authorities would think not of his own county alone but of other counties also. He could not see why these bodies having a direct interest in the matters in question should be excluded from representation on the authority of the Port of London. They were not heard by the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is important that a Committee of the Whole House should not criticise other Committees, although, of course, arguments affecting onr action may be founded upon what has taken place in other Committees. Still less should the hon. Member criticise a Joint Committee.

*MR. CAVE said he would of course follow the ruling of the Chairman and endeavour to suppress his feelings with regard to what took place in the Committee. When the Thames Conservancy was formed in 1874, these counties bordering on the Thames had representation given to them in the manner now suggested, viz., by putting members of the county authorities on the Board of the Conservancy. What was just then was just now. He was now dealing with that part of Surrey which came below Teddington lock, and which was brought within the area of the Port of London. That being so, Surrey ought to have representation on the Port authority. It seemed to him a matter of simple justice that all these counties should have a representative. An addition of four or five members to the board would not make much difference. There were twenty-eight members now, there would be thirty-two members then. Twenty-eight was somewhat too large a number to conduct business without delegating some of the work to committees. Thirty-two members would not be very much greater, and he could not understand why if twenty-eight members formed a workable board a board of thirty-two members would be so objectionable. There were many members who felt very strongly on this matter, and he hoped the Government would give way and would drop their number of ten, in order that representatives of these counties might be added in their place.

*MR. RUSSELL REA was glad to have this opportunity of hearing the accusation made that the Committee did not hear the case of the counties.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot go into that matter now. I have already said that it is not desirable for this Committee to criticise other Committees.

*MR. RUSSELL REA: In obeying your ruling, Sir, I suppose it will not be forbidden to me to defend the action taken by the Joint Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is not our business to criticise another Committee, and therefore it is not necessary to defend the action of any other Committee.

*MR. RUSSELL REA said it appeared to him, and it appeared to the Committee, after studying the petitions of the counties, after hearing all the cross-examination of the Board of Trade witnesses, that the admission of representatives of individual counties, in addition to the appointed members under the Bill, would be to encourage sectional representation of the very worst kind. The worst kind of sectional representation was geographical sectional representation, and he did not think there could be a better illustration of that than the two speeches to which the Committee had just listened from the hon. Members for Mid-Kent and Kingston. They both disclaimed any idea of sectional treatment, but their arguments were based on their sectional claims and the local interests that might be endangered or promoted in their particular localities. That was an argument against their being on the Port authority and not in favour of their being represented. They wished to safeguard against damage to or to promote local interests so far as they as local representatives could do. If they wished to safeguard local interests their proper way to do so was by the way of saving clauses. All proper saving clauses which were put before the Committee were admitted. What was wanted on the Port of London authority were members who were anxious to promote the commerce of the country and the interests of the Port of London as a whole. It further appeared to him and to the Committee that the proportion of appointed members was quite large enough, in fact, too large. The Committee, however, kept to the number of appointed members and did not decrease it, but they did increase the number of the elective members from fourteen to eighteen. It was said that the constitution of the Port authority was not entirely satisfactory. The democratic principle was that taxation and representation should go together, and that those who had to maintain and support the great properties which would be entrusted to this authority should constitute the governing body. As it was, they had a majority, though not an excessive majority. After reading the petitions very carefully, and after hearing all the cross-examination by the counsel for those counties, thus gathering entirely what the case for those counties was, the Committee came to the conclusion, as he had come to the conclusion, that if the county representatives were to be admitted to the Port authority, they should prefer that they had the county of Merioneth rather than the county of Middlesex, simply because it had less local, sectional, and geographical interests. It was complained that the London County Council was over-represented. He was not there to defend the extent of that representation, but it might be observed that they had a sort of historic claim from their connection with this question, which originated with them, and from the various generous offers they had made in former times to contribute millions of money out of their own pocket and to guarantee the debt of the authority. All that had gone, but the position of the County Council was to some extent maintained, and in the opinion of the Board of Trade and of the Government, having regard to the sectional interests of the ratepayers of the Port and seeing that a large number of appointed members appeared to be necessary—it was probably better to follow the example given in previous Bills and accept the London County Council as in a general way representative of municipal and outside local opinion. Of course, the representation of the City of London was on an absolutely different footing. The City of London had no geographical interest to safeguard, and had no undeveloped property on the river frontage; it had no manufactures there, and its interest was entirely the whole interest of the Port and of the commercial community. Therefore, they came to the conclusion, first, that they would not on any account increase the number of appointed members, but they did increase by one the representation of the City of London, and they did it at the expense of the London County Council.

Sir **GILBERT PARKER** (Gravesend) said he was unable to follow the hon. Member in his argument defending the London County Council. The hon. Member had just said that the London County Council was representative of interests inside and outside of London. He presumed he meant that it covered the interests of Kent, Essex, Surrey, and Middlesex. He could imagine those counties listening to that statement.

*MR. RUSSELL REA: I did not say that.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: That the hon. Member did not make that statement is correct, but if the hon. Member's statement did not mean that then I am unable to understand what it did mean. The hon. Member said the London County Council represented vast outside interests.

*MR. RUSSELL REA: No, I did not say that. I said that the County Council, seeing that so many appointed members appeared to be necessary, might be taken as representative of municipal and local feeling generally.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Municipal and local feeling generally. Did the hon. Member mean municipal and local opinion in Kent, Surrey, Essex, and Middlesex? That was exactly what he meant, and what he understood from the speech of the hon. Gentleman. But surely the hon. Member's argument would not hold water for one minute. Let him suggest to the President of the Board of Trade that he would meet a very just claim and appeal by cutting down the representation of the London County Council. The London County Council had no more direct interest in the welfare of the Port of London than Kent, Surrey, Middlesex or Essex.

MR. CHURCHILL: Its interest is much more general.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he could not quite see that. But even if the London County Council had a greater interest than any of those counties, it was still not a sufficient reason for refusing the application and appeal of those counties. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised if he dropped this provision. He must agree with him in saying, however, that they ought not to have a body which was too unwieldy. He thought that twenty-eight was a very considerable number, but as his hon. and learned friend had observed, the difference between twenty-eight and thirty-two was not great, when it represented the removal of injustice. He believed it was an unjust thing not to give those four counties bordering on the river, and having great interests, due and proper representation. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman. He believed the whole sense of the House and of the country would be with them in this appeal to lower the representation of the London County Council, and give those four counties the representation which the London County Council had. He would make the representation of the London County Council consist of one selected by them inside the body, and one selected outside the body. That, he thought, would be very just. Why they should exalt the London County Council and represent its interest to be so much greater than the interests of the counties of Surrey, Kent, Essex and Middlesex he could not understand. Why should they absolutely ignore the interests of those counties? It had been said by the hon. Member opposite that theirs was a purely sectional interest. He thought on second thoughts he would reverse his opinion. If he asked, as representing the Borough of Gravesend, for representation on the Board, then they might accuse him of asking for section representation. If the Member for Rotherhithe were to ask for a representative of that constituency, then he could be accused of asking for sectional representation. But, as his hon. friend pointed out, they had, in Kent alone, a population of over 1,000,000; they had vast interests which could not be considered as local interests, or as sectional. It was suggested that great counties representing vast geographical areas, in asking for moderate representation by the appointment of three or four members to this Board were asking for the representation of sectional interests. That was not in accordance with the facts. The hon. Member had talked about the historic claim of the London County Council, but that body was an exceedingly modern institution, and to talk of it as one of the hoary institutions of the country, having established a record for great efforts on behalf of the community, and receiving the general appreciation of the public on that ground, he ventured to say was quite unreasonable. There was no historic claim on the part of the London County Council. If they were going to have historic claims, then surely the counties of Kent and Surrey could put forward an historic claim. [AN HON. MEMBER: Essex.] He did not exclude Essex. He hoped the hon. Member would establish the claim of Essex in the speech which he trusted he would deliver to the Committee. When the right hon. Gentleman suggested that sectional representation was behind this appeal on behalf of the counties, he had not even been true to the principles laid down in his own Bill. Let the Committee look at subsection (7), where a representative of Labour was deliberately to be chosen by the Board of Trade. Surely that was sectional. He did not object to it at all, but he did object to the right hon. Gentleman talking about sectional representation when the Board of Trade deliberately said—"We are going to give to Labour, a section of the community, a representative, on this Board." He did not think that the arguments which had been adduced were satisfactory, and while he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the authority ought to be limited in number, and ought to be kept down if possible to at most thirty, he submitted that that result could be achieved by taking two or three from the London County Council and giving them to the other counties.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester) was glad to have an opportunity of emphasising the non-party aspect of this question, and, therefore, he supported his hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Medway division and the hon. Member for Gravesend. The President of the Board of Trade had emphasised the fact that the Port authority was in a sense already too large. But he would point out that as it was so large already, and the delegation of work was necessitated by the present number, the addition of two members, one representing one section, and another for Kent, would not add to his difficulties in that respect. Then the right hon. Gentleman made reference to the number discussed in Committee, but might he remind him that since the time to which he referred the number has been increased from fourteen to eighteen, What they were asking was that the number of appointed members should now be increased. Counsel were engaged at very great expense on this very point, but they were not heard, and, therefore, it was scarcely open to the President of the Board of Trade to say that upstairs they had every opportunity of being heard.

MR. CHURCHILL: I did not say that. I said that the Committee had given full consideration to the matter, and they declined to give the representation asked for.

MR. E. H. LAMB did not think the right hon. Gentleman had gainsaid his statement, but he must not be drawn into criticism of the action of the Joint Committee. He wished, however, to refer to some of the objections raised in Committee to the Amendment moved by his hon. and gallant friend. First of all, they were told by one of the speakers against the Amendment—he thought it was the Chairman of the Joint Committee—that they ought if they had some representation also to have some financial responsibility. He would point out to him that this very argument would apply with equal strength against the London County Council and the City Corporation. They had representation and no financial responsibility. He was not arguing that the City Corporation should lose one of its representatives, but what was fair for them was equally or still more fair for Kent and for Essex. When they remembered that both Kent and Essex had nearly 1,000,000 acres and almost 1,000,000 inhabitants, surely they had some right with their great river frontage to some representation on the Port authority. Then he wanted to emphasise the fact that under the Thames Conservancy Act of 1894, both counties actually had representatives, and also that the Royal Commission, appointed in 1900, reported in favour of both Kent and Essex having representation. Under this Bill the extension of the limits of the Port took in a far greater frontage of both the counties. Then again, the question of dredging had been emphasised. A very large portion of both counties lay below the level of the Thames, and the Royal Commission reported very strongly upon this point. In Section 5 of the Report they said—

> "A full description of the estuary of the Thames from the Nore to Gravesend is given in

the Report of the Lower Thames Navigation Commission, and it is, therefore, unnecessary for us to deal with this part of the subject ."

Again, in Section 56 they said—

> "We desire to call special attention to the expression of the views of the Lower Thames Navigation Commission in certain paragraphs of their Report."

The paragraph they referred to was this—

> "Above Gravesend there may possibly be some complications affecting the feasibility of any serious deepening of the river by reason of valuable properties in places bordering on its banks, and there may be questions as to the stability of the embankments which protect low-lying lands from being overflowed. These matters would require careful examination."

The Royal Commission, in reporting, emphasised that broad fact which had been found by the previous Commission, and was more accentuated to-day than ever. They had had a somewhat recent experience. They knew what happened for six months—the direct railway service between London and Tilbury was interrupted. He knew he would be met by the right hon. Gentleman when he said Section 42 deprived the Port authority of the protection they would otherwise have by acting upon statutory powers in the event of actions against them for special damage by dredging. That might safeguard the interests of a great railway company like the London and Tilbury, but it would be very difficult for the owner or occupier of a small cottage or other small property to make good his claim for compensation without the assistance of of local representation, and that was another argument in favour of their contention that they should have direct representation of both the Kent and Essex County Councils. Then the county council in each case were the health authority for their respective counties. He should be bound to vote against the Government. He desired that ten should be deleted in order that twelve might be inserted, because he felt that if the case was considered impartially, as they were unable to have it considered before the Joint Committee, Members must feel that they had made out a case, and he, therefore, asked the right hon. Gentleman to listen to their appeal and settle this very vexed question.

Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said that perhaps most of them were, as regarded the Government aspect of the matter, belligerent; one would like to hear a little more said for the measure. The right hon. Gentleman shook his head. He could assure him one could be sufficiently belligerent, but the Chairman's ruling had relieved him, he was glad to say, of an unpleasant task. But there was one statement which the hon. Member for Gloucester made to which he was sure the Chairman would allow him to reply, and that was that he had heard cross-examination by opposing counsel. He had extracts from the minutes of the proceedings, and the county which he represented was deliberately stopped in the cross-examination of witnesses. He was sure the hon. Member, when he refreshed his memory, would agree with him that he was mistaken when he made that statement. It was curious that the Chairman of the Committee should have used the name of his county when he said if they were to have this, which he regarded as the worst of all sectional representation—representation by county—he would rather it was the county of Merioneth than Middlesex. The case of Middlesex was an overwhelming case. In no sense of the word could it be regarded as sectional representation. These large outlying counties were just as much the county of London as any other part of the country. Middlesex now had a population of 1,060,000, the bulk of whom went into London and contributed to the wealth of inner London. Surely they should be represented, and unless they got this representation by county they would be wholly shut out. Even the industrial classes, by means of locomotion, were now going out afield, instead of stopping in these areas, and the result was that they were giving to a very limited electorate an opportunity for representation which they were denying to the day population of those areas which lived in Middlesex, Surrey, and Kent. There was a very strong additional reason why Middlesex should have representation. It was given power by Parliament ten years ago to be the river pollution authority for the county, and the rivers of Middlesex flowed into the Thames. Not only was the population vast, but the rateable value also was a matter of concern, because it showed the immense financial interests at stake. He was sure, under these circumstances, it was not fair to say that the London County Council were representative in the least degree of these great interests which were only in a secondary degree, and in a transitory way, attachable to the County of London. The right hon. Gentleman would not say that the increase in the number of the Port authority from twenty-eight to thirty-eight, or thirty-two, would appreciably affect its working. He did not know that the right hon. Gentleman had ever given a portion of his time to the service of municipal or county authorities, but he was sure he would take it from those who had given their time and labour to the less illustrious and, perhaps, less rewarded service of municipal authorities that the difference could not be appreciable. He asked the Government to abandon that *non possumus* attitude which they appeared to have pursued all the way through, and to concede to these outlying districts, which were now a vital part of London, the representation which was asked.

*MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) said he rose to join the chorus of geographical sections pressing upon the President of the Board of Trade the amendment which had been moved. He noticed that the President, in his reply to the mover of the Amendment, began by recognising the *prima facie* justice of the demand, and to anyone who for a moment realised the facts the admission of the President became self-evident. Here they had two counties through which the river flowed. The limits of the ports extended for something like forty miles down the river from London, but there were only eight or ten miles of London in it, and they gave practically the whole of the Board to this little area of eight or ten miles. He admitted that it was the wealthiest and most important part, but they neglected the whole of the other Counties extending fifty miles on each side of the river. Of course, the President was acutely dialectical as always in the way he met the Amendment. He said that if he yielded to Kent he would have to yield to four or five other people who were pressing him. He did not altogether agree with that answer to the Amendment. It depended not upon the number of the demands but upon the justice and the character of each demand whether they ought to yield to it or not, and he did not admit for a moment that Kent and Essex were to be placed upon the same level as Middlesex and Surrey. Let them consider for a moment. They had six or seven miles of Surrey and Middlesex apart from London in the port area. They had thirty or forty miles of the Kent and Essex portion of the river, which included manufactories and wharves of an infinitely greater size, and where he ventured to say there was from fifty to 100 times as much business done as in the Surrey and Middlesex part. Therefore, he suggested, to the President of the Board of Trade that if he applied his mind to the demands of particular counties he would come to the conclusion that the demand of Surrey and Middlesex might be fairly met by giving them a member between them. He might remind the Committee that the Metropolitan Water Bill contained provisions whereby several local authorities united to elect a member, and he submitted it would be perfectly easy to apply that principle to the present Bill. The President of the Board of Trade went on to say that if they had these four or five members the body would become too large. If they were going to have a small body for the purpose of doing the work it must practically be a committee. Substantially, there was no difference between a body which had over fifteen or sixteen members and one which had between thirty and forty members. The moment they exceeded fifteen or sixteen for the purposes of committee deliberations they might as well go up to thirty or forty members. That was so in this particular case, and it was absurd to pretend that the increase in the number of the members of this Board from twenty-eight to thirty-two or thirty-three could really make any difference at all in the deliberative character of the Board. The President of the Board of Trade went on to tell them that the addition of these three or four members would hamper and paralyse the work of the Board. He thought that language was somewhat exaggerated. Why should the addition of four members elected by county councils who were presumably men of knowledge, who wished well to the

Port of London, and who wanted the Port of London to be a great port, be any obstacle to the success of the right hon. Gentleman's Bill? Why on earth they should hamper and paralyse the action of the Board passed his comprehension. They would be there to guard particular interests, and subject to that they would give their very best attention to the work of the Board and devote their best services to bringing about the objects which the right hon. Gentleman had in view in his Bill. The Chairman of the Committee, the hon. Member for Gloucester, had told them that the representation of Kent and Essex would be a geographical representation, and that that was sectional representation of the worst kind. The hon. Member, however, did not bring a single argument forward to prove his bare statement. In almost all ports in the Kingdom they proceeded upon the basis of geographical representation. That was a principle almost without exception, and to come to the House of Commons at the present day with a grave face and tell them that geographical representation was the worst kind of representation seemed to him to be one of the worst kinds of argument which he had heard for a long time. There was a very great deal to be said for the argument of the Secretary to the Board of Trade that when dealing with the trade of London as a whole, when they did not know what really were the diverse interests in trade and when they could not apportion representation fairly and equally amongst all the interests concerned, they had better elect the Board *en bloc* and trust to the best men being elected. That did not interfere with the argument he was urging. He was taking the House away from the mass of the trade of London and directing its attention to those outlying parts of other counties which were necessarily involved in the creation of a great port for London. They were not introducing sectional interests into the administration of the Port, but they were asking to have introduced into the governing body the representation of interests which sometimes might be adverse to the whole interest of London, but which still were interests which were definite and which were not likely seriouly to conflict with the rest of London. Illustrations had been given in the way of the walls of the river. It had been pointed out how an alteration in the channel brought about through dredging, which would be a perfectly legitimate operation for the benefit of London, might yet do very serious injury to the wharves on the river. There was another point which especially concerned the constituency which he represented. The Medway and the Swale were exempt from the operation of the Bill; the dredging of the Thames, however, might affect the channel of the Medway and the Swale, and, therefore, in any plan for the dredging of the channel it was only reasonable that the representative of Kent should have an opportunity of making his voice heard. It might be said by the right hon. Gentleman that if any damage was done to Kent or Essex, they would have their remedy under the Bill. He knew that under certain sections they might bring an action for damages against the Port authority. He did not think that they were sufficiently protected in that way. No doubt a really wrongful act done by the new Port authority might be actionable. If they negligently broke any sea wall, they would be liable, but if they did damage by an alteration of the channel, and it could be proved that their action was necessary for the development in the best possible way of the Port of London, they would have no remedy at all. The commonsense of the House did not approve of a position of that kind. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman on the front bench that they ought to ask for no representation in the Bill which would injure the constitution of the Board as a whole. They wanted the Board to represent the trade of London, and he agreed that there ought not to be such a number of external elements as would imperil the efficiency of the Board as a whole. He submitted there was a clear case here in which they had three or four counties who might be vitally interested in what was done by this Port authority who were not likely, if they had the privilege of electing members, to send gentlemen who would either hamper or harass its work. These counties had enormous interests which might be effected by the Bill, and it was only in accordance with precedent provisions about affiliation, the admission of outside societies to the government of this Roman Catholic University, in order to see what he meant. He said without fear of contradiction that the right hon. Gentleman had bought everybody it was necessary to buy. Under these circumstances what was his object in describing this as an undenominational measure? What was his object in putting in a clause forbidding a test for teachers? What would the right hon. Gentleman say of an Education Bill for England in which there was a specific clause forbidding any test for teachers, but in which the management of the schools or Universities was carefully secured to the various denominations? What chance would a Protestant have of obtaining an appointment in a Roman Catholic college or University?

MR. BIRRELL: Plenty.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: The right hon. Gentleman said "Plenty"; he was not so trustful of English boards of management in connection with English schools. [AN HON. MEMBER: "They were not elected."] Nor are these. The right hon. Gentleman had unfortunately been entrusted with the introduction of two Education Bills, and when one looked at the essentially undenominational character of the Bill of 1906, and the essentially denominational character of the Bill of 1908, he could only congratulate him on an exhibition of political dexterity.

MR. BIRRELL: Have you read Clause 4 in the Bill of 1906?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the right hon. Gentleman had repeatedly described that clause as a denominational clause in an undenominational Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that the merit of it was that it was there at all, and he minimised it to an extent which made it practically useless for a great denomination to which education in this country owed so much. He rose only to express his profound disappointment in this matter. He could not vote for the rejection of the first clause of the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: Why not?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would tell the right hon. Gentleman. He thought it was essential that the highest education available should be at the service of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, as they could best procure it. He would gladly have seen the Bill so framed that the advancement of learning and the opportunities of study might be equally available for the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic Church, but he did not believe that any University, the main purpose of which was the advancement of learning, could discharge that purpose rightly which was under clerical domination, whether that domination was of a Nonconformist, Anglican, or Roman Catholic character. Such as it was, he accepted the Bill for what it was worth, but he thought the House and the country ought to realise the character of the Bill they were passing, the extraordinary contradiction in the action of the Government in regard to education in Ireland and in England, and the fact that they were passing a frankly denominational measure which placed education in Ireland in the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

MR. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said he desired to make one other protest against the root principle of the Bill. The hon. Baronet had concluded his speech by referring to this Bill as frankly denominational. He had always taken that view, and he did not think his right hon. friend could blame him for having done so, and for voting against the Bill on that ground. Clause 1 had been specially advocated on four grounds, namely, that the Universities were too free, non-federal, residential, and undenominational. All those four defences of the clause were absolutely unsound. He did not think, in the first instance, that the new Dublin University could be regarded as free. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of it as a University that would be entirely under clerical control. [Cries of "Oh! oh!"] That was met by cries of "Oh! oh!" but there were two strongly opposed opinions in regard to the matter, and to meet these views his right hon. friend had introduced in the schedule many checks and counter checks to get this kind of influence and the other kind of influence to work. When that was the case, the Government could not claim that they had carried out the when they looked at the Bill they found that the real difficulty arose, because they then found that there were a number of nominated members of exactly the class which the President of the Board of Trade said ought not to be on the body. There were to be two from the London County Council who were members of that body and two more who were not members of it—four in all—from the London County Council. There were to be two from the City of London, and one from Trinity House. What on earth Trinity House wanted with a representative on the Port of London Authority which was to be a business body, he could not conceive. It would be quite right that the Admiralty should have one and that the Board of Trade should have two, especially for the purpose ot nominating as one of those men, a leading Labour man. But when they found that the whole of the arguments of the Government, and the whole of the arguments of the President of the Board of Trade, were given away by the Bill, and that there were these nominated members to represent geographical areas, then they were face to face in this particular Amendment with the question. Why should not Kent have one? If they conceded that the London County Council should have four, and that the City of London should have two, there was no answer to the claim of Kent for one. Some observations had been made with reference to Essex. He heard an hon. Member rather belittle Essex as if Essex ought not to have a member. If he knew anything of the limits of the Port of London he would have thought that a large part of the practical work of the docks was done in Essex. Why should not Essex have a representative if any county was to be represented at all on this body? The real truth of the matter was this. The proposal of the Government was wrong because it was not consistent, because it had picked out one body and given it an overwhelming representation to the exclusion of other bodies which had as great, if not a greater, right to be represented. He asked himself how it was that the County Council had slipped in for four members, and the City of London for two. He thought the provisions of the previous Bill cast a little light on that. Under the previous Bill the body proposed to be set up was to be largely dependent for its finance on the City of London, and in that case it was right that it should have considerable representation in respect of its pecuniary relations to the body. But when they read this Bill through, they found that there was not a pennyworth of pecuniary responsibility cast upon the City of London one way or the other, and, therefore, on these grounds they had no right to have any representation at all. The real justice of the position demanded that all these County Council representatives should go, and if the President of the Board of Trade were present—he saw that the right hon Gentleman was ably represented—and if he were willing to strike out the London County Council altogether, one of the two members for the City of London, and the Trinity House man—it was a ridiculous suggestion that Trinity House should have a representative—if the right hon Gentleman would say that he would not have any of these people, the position of the Government would be consistent and logical; on all sides of the House there would be hardly any question that it was just and right, and they would be prepared to leave the question of the administration of the Port of London to this newly constituted body consisting almost entirely of *bona fide* elected members representing the people who paid the money and those two or three nominated members to whom he had referred, such as the representatives of the Admiralty and the Board of Trade. He stood up to advocate the principle which he believed was the democratic solution of this matter, namely, to leave the whole of these men out, but if the Government and the President of the Board of Trade insisted on keeping the four County Council representatives, the two from the City of London, and one from Trinity House, it seemed to him that it was not logical that the legitimate claim of Kent, Essex, Surrey, and Middlesex to be represented should be refused. As for the statement of the Chairman of the Joint Committee, that he would prefer the county of Merioneth to be inserted, he would say that it was a paradox, because it really did mean something. It puzzled him for some time, but he thought the hon. Member really meant that it was very objectionable from his point of view to have on the Port authority half a dozen members representing isolated interests and who practically came there as respectable leading men in the County Council and elsewhere, though they were not in the front rank as active business men of the day. The hon. Member meant that it was objectionable to have them on the Board, and that he would prefer that they should come from Merioneth where he would get men who would not understand the English language, and therefore. would not be able to take a lengthy part in the debates. He fancied that was the idea he had in his mind, if there was any idea at all in the observation he made. He thought that was as near the sense of it as they could get. He appealed to the President of the Board of Trade to knock out all these nominated geographical members. If he did so they would all be pleased, but if he insisted on keeping them in, the other areas had an equal right to representation.

MR. ROWLANDS said he had listened with very great interest to the arguments put forward by the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn and the hon. Member for Gloucester, and he must say that when he heard the reasons why they arrived at a certain conclusion he was somewhat astounded at the frame of mind they must have been in. They had both spoken against the Amendment proposed by his hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Medway Division, and they had told the Committee that if they had had their way they would have taken out the whole of the nominated members from the Bill. Had they recommended that course to the Board of Trade, possibly the Board would have listened to their wisdom, and, as had just been said, they would all have been satisfied that the Port authority was to be elected by the people who had to find the means whereby the expenditure in connection with this new body was to be carried on. But under existing circumstances he could not for the life of him see how they had arrived at the conclusion to oppose the whole series of Amendments that dealt with the extension of the representation on the authority. They had heard over and over again from those Gentlemen, and also from the President of the Board of Trade, that the one thing they did not want was sectional representation. He thought they had got that word "sectional" into their minds until it had become so absorbing to them that it had excluded all other thoughts. How could it be sectional representation if the nominee represented the whole of a great county with all its varied interests? Indeed, in the case of Essex and Kent, when the river was under the control of the Thames Conservancy, these two great counties had representation on that body. [AN HON. MEMBER: They were the best working members of it.] He thought what the hon Member had stated had also been the experience of those who knew the working of the Board. The calibre of the men who were to be put on the new authority had been very much discussed. They had had experience in Kent of the class of gentlemen nominated by that county to look after the interests and the well-being of the river, and he ventured to say that those sent to the Thames Conservancy Board were men of the class who would be sent by the County Council of Kent, and they would be quite equal to any representatives elected in any other way. The position so far as the Government were concerned was absolutely illogical, for having said that they wanted a body representative of the interests of the people who found the money, they conceded that nominated members should be on the body. When they looked at the varied interests all round the coast which have to be considered it was most surprising to him that the hon. Members who had taken part in the debate seemed to have the notion that somewhere outside the boundaries of London there were some wilds and marshes called the counties of Kent and Essex. That was amusing to those who knew the river. He remembered that on the Second Reading debate the President of the Board of Trade, talking about cheap land, said there were wilds that might be bought near the river. He asked him to go to Kent or Essex, outside of London, and he would find that, instead of having to deal with some wilds which were derelict, from the moment he crossed Abbey Wood into Kent, or the river Darenth into the Erith district, he was face to face with a population which at the time of the last census was 25,000. They had in that district alone industries of the largest magnitude—firms whose names were historic, whether it was in connection with armaments, engineering, cables, coal, or other industries. He had lists of them, and he could show that millions of money were involved in those industries. That was only taking the boundary of the river, but if they went further they came to the town of Gravesend. They went beyond that, and had the biggest cement industry in the world; and then they went on to the other divisions until they got to the docks. What was the case so far as Kent was concerned? In this Bill it had been thought judicious—he was not criticising that — to remove the old boundaries of the Thames Conservancy, and to go further into the sea. They had travelled down the whole coast of Kent and Essex, and they had taken the whole of the interest there into their keeping. When the interests involved were of such magnitude, he could not understand, for the life of him, how a business-like body such as the Board of Trade, having conceded nominee members on the Port authority, could ignore the vast industries on the lower reaches of the river. They had adopted the attitude of the Medes and Persians, and they would not give way. But what justification could they have for their conduct? None whatever. They had all an interest in looking after the well-being of the river. The question of dredging had been put forward. They had, in his own constituency, two important creeks where dredging had taken place; but they might be affected by the general dredging of the river, and what representation could they have on the Thames Conservancy? One of the creeks was two miles long, and there were busy industries on that portion of the river. It might be said that the other representatives on the authority would represent their interests, but neither the London County Council nor the City Corporation were interested in their welfare. They had their own interests to look after, and were not concerned with theirs. And therefore some indiscretion might arise, with the best intention, affecting detrimentally the whole of the trade of that part of Kent, and incidentally affecting a large portion of the labour engaged in it. He had put the case of the dredging already before the Board of Trade, and had pointed out where the dredging of the river had affected business-places on shore. A great point, so far as Kent and Essex were concerned, was that every single scheme of any magnitude that was talked about for the improvement of the Port of London was not within the boundaries of London, but on portions of the river outside London, and within the range of Kent and Essex, whether it were the projected barrage or the sea-wall, and yet no representation was given to these counties. It was not that they had not a good case. It was admitted that they had a good case, but the argument was: "We do not want to extend the numbers of the Port authority." He could have understood that if the Port authority had been constituted of a dozen persons who could have managed the whole thing without cutting up the body into committees. That was a matter for consideration. But they had extended the members to twenty-eight, and that was a body which could not discuss all the details. One of the first things the new Port authority would have to do was to subdivide itself into committees, and all they said was that having created a body of that size, and having admitted the fact that there were all these industries to be considered in Kent and Essex, they ought to concede some representation on that great body to these counties, because their interests were the same as those of the rest of the Port of London. But it was said that this would be something in the way of sectional representation. It was ridiculous to talk of sectional representation coming from a county like Kent, with its varied interests, on a public body that was to control the whole of the river. He maintained that they might have a representative from the County of Kent capable of looking after the well-being of the Port of London as a whole and all those things that were for the well-being of the country at large. They were told about the consumers and that London was getting representation on account of the consumers; but when he spoke of these counties of Kent and Essex he spoke for over a million of consumers. Therefore they had a right to plead with the Board of Trade to give them that representation which would not overweight the Port authority.

*MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.) said he could not altogether subscribe to the doctrine preached by the hon. Member on the opposite benches and by the Chairman of the Committee who sat on this Bill because they said that taxation and representation ought to go together. He agreed to a large extent with that principle, but he could not subscribe to it in regard to this particular question, for if only the gentlemen who paid the dues were to be represented on the Port authority, he was afraid that there would be a quarrel between the section which represented the docks and the section which represented the river, and the result would be that those who represented the docks would be trying to shift the responsibility from their own shoulders on to the shoulders of those who represented the river. And that would not work. He did not altogether agree with the argument of his friend when he said that the Government ought to knock out the representatives of the London County Council and of the City Corporation. He had no objection to the power given to the London County Council and the City Corporation, for there was no doubt that the gentlemen selected from these bodies would do their best to increase the trade of the Port. But it did not altogether follow that the London County Council in selecting two from within and two from without their number, and the City Corporation in selecting one from within and one from without would get the best representatives. They might select from without the biggest duffers. Then there was another danger, because every three years they had a County Council election, and there might be a complete change in the composition of the County Council, and if the representatives of the County Council lost their seats on the County Council there would have to be a fresh change of the men interested in the business of the river. The representative of the Board of Trade had said that a case had been made out by some of the previous speakers, and he took it that he should have to make out a case for West Ham, South. He did not think he would have very much trouble in doing that. He thought that the President of the Board of Trade was somewhat mistaken in regard to the particular Amendment before the House, because he said that if that Amendment were carried it would mean that the whole of the counties would call for representation on the Port authority. He did not read the Amendment in that direction. He took it that, if it were carried, instead of there being ten representatives there would be eleven; and if that were so it would then devolve on the Board of Trade to choose another representative for the counties of Kent, Essex, and Middlesex. He agreed that it would be much better, and more satisfactory to all concerned, if these representatives were appointed for Kent, Essex and the borough of West Ham. It appeared to him that the Government were responsible for the lengthy debate because it would have been curtailed had there been a chance on the Second Reading of the Bill to thrash out all these matters they were now discussing. So far as West Ham was concerned, they had a great interest at stake. They had two miles of river frontage leading to the Thames, and had the whole of the Victoria Dock in the centre of the borough, and also part of the Albert Dock, and a rental value of £75,000. In the face of these facts he thought the Government ought to agree to give them a representation on the Port authority. When the Thames Conservancy Act was passed in 1904 the information given to the Committee was of such importance that they agreed to give the borough of West Ham one representative; but where this new authority was to be established they would not only be deprived of their representation, but other districts would also lose their representation. He could not see why the Government should have given four representatives to the London County Council and two to the City Corporation. He took it that they would not alter that representation, but in the face of the tremendous amount of business to be brought before the new authority, and the great stake they in West Ham had in the matter, he appealed most earnestly to the Government to make the small concession to West Ham which had been asked for by all sides of the House. He had been in the House for some three years and had listened to many discussions with regard to various Bills, but he had never found such earnest appeals made from all quarters of the House to the Government to change the position that they had already taken up. He, therefore, endorsed the appeal to the President of the Local Government Board to make this small concession so that they could get on to the other clauses.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said he did not look with any enthusiasm upon the measure, and the condition of the House suggested that he was not alone in the attitude he took up with regard to it as a London Member. He found some difficulty, rather, because of the authority which was to be set up, in warmly supporting the Board of Trade and thanking them for the Bill. Personally, he regretted that this was a case in which London was to have another *ad hoc* authority set up. He had hoped that the case might be dealt with in the large measure of London reform which the Government was considering for next year, and he thought the matter might have waited till then. They heard that those who paid the dues were the persons who ought to be represented on the authority, and they also heard that those who paid the dues indirectly were the consumers, and it was consumers who ought to be largely represented on such a body as this. Indeed, the justification for the representation of the London County Council and the City Corporation was said by the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn to be that they largely represented the consumers, and that that was the justification for the representation. He thought that the argument ought not to have stopped there. He considered that this was largely a consumers' question and that the question of the reform of the Port of London ought to be, if it was not, one of the primary municipal concerns of London. They had been told from the other side that they lacked civic enthusiasm and enterprise in London, but the Government were not likely to encourage that enthusiasm or enterprise by giving such a small share to London's municipalities in such a scheme as this. He could have wished that the model of Bristol had been taken rather than that of Liverpool. He had visited Bristol and had seen the civic enthusiasm there. On the Continent they might search in vain for any such authority in any port as that set up by this Bill. He regretted that the majority was given to the so-called elected element. He would have increased the appointed members over the elected members, and have begged for a larger representation for the London County Council and the Corporation. He regretted that the London County Council had not seen its way to assume any financial liability in the matter, but he hoped and trusted a future council might take a different view in regard to that. He deeply regretted that London was to be fobbed off with, and have foisted on it another *ad hoc* authority, and that the municipal representation upon the new authority was to be so small. This great question of the Port of London, which ought to occupy the interest and excite the enthusiasm of the citizens of London, was not likely to achieve that end while the authority had such small municipal representation. He wished the Continental system had been accepted here. The port of the capital of the Empire ought to be regarded as a matter of Imperial concern, or at least as a matter of municipal concern, and he urged that the municipal representation ought to be far larger than it was in the Bill put before them.

*MR. WHITEHEAD regretted very much that sitting on that side of the House he was unable to accept the suggestion of the President of the Board of Trade that they should not press this matter. Speaking on behalf of the County of Essex he felt bound to urge their very important interests affecting the Port of London. The fact was that on the Second Reading the Government, he thought, injudiciously insisted upon closuring the debate and not allowing these matters to be discussed. That, he thought, would have been the right opportunity to have cleared the air with regard to these matters which appeared upon the Order Paper. At that time he gave notice to move an Instruction to the Committee dealing with this very matter but Mr. Speaker intimated to him that it would not be in order. He was afraid if he were to state to the Committee the reasons Mr. Speaker gave he would seem to be trespassing beyond the limits of the ruling given that evening by the Chairman's predecessor in the Chair when he said they were not to criticise the action of the Committee upstairs. But on the Second Reading no opportunity was given for considering this matter. The debate had covered a very large number of points, and he hoped to confine himself within the strictest limits, but he could not help thinking after listening to the speech of the President of the Board of Trade, which he did most carefully, that the right hon. gentleman had sympathy with the views he was expressing, and that in his heart he thought they were right. But he had used one or two phrases of a rather rhetorical character about pampering and paralysing the action of the Port authority. He would put it before the Committee, that this was a serious business question, and the use of fine phrases on one side or the other did not afford any guidance to the Committee. They had heard strange contributions from the members of the Joint Committee who had taken part in the debate. One of them ventured to put forward the suggestion—the farcical suggestion, if he might say so—that the County of Merioneth was as much and more entitled to representation than the counties of Essex and Kent, and that the London County Council had some great historical claim to be represented. These considerations had been dealt with by previous speakers, but he could only say that, representing one of the divisions of Essex which was interested in the port, they entirely repudiated the suggestion that the London County Council in any way represented their interests or could represent them. The interests of the London County Council were entirely in conflict with those of Essex in many important particulars, and it seemed very hard that the London County Council should be represented in so large a degree whereas Essex interests were entirely disregarded. It was not as if Essex had not a historic claim. It had, it was not a very ancient one, but at all events since 1894 they had had a representative on the Thames Conservancy who had looked after their local and business interests affecting Essex along the Essex shore. What the Government were doing was absolutely to disfranchise the County of Essex in respect of this question. It was a very strong action on their part, and he submitted that to do this simultaneously with giving a large representation to the County Council of London was a very unusual and a very unwise step to take. He submitted a short time ago to the House when they were considering the Electricity Bill, that the Board of Trade, in the outlook which they had with respect to such questions were guided by rather narrow considerations. They looked only at the existing facts, whereas he submitted to-day, as he submitted a fortnight ago, that the Board of Trade, being a great public Department, ought seriously to look at the trend of events. When they were dealing with the River Thames, no man who was aware of the state of things existing to-day could shut his eyes to the fact that the great manufacturing and shipping business of the Port of London was drifting away from the centre of London itself and going outside the boundaries of the London County Council and settling along the shores of the river on both sides. That being so, and although the County of Essex had only the interests of consumers approximating to 1,000,000 persons, there could be little doubt that as years passed on its interest, even from the consuming point of view, would be actually greater and relatively far larger compared with London than it was to-day, and he could not help submitting that the interests of people carrying on their life's work on the Thames between

Barking and the sea were as much at stake and they had as much right to representation on this authority as the inhabitants of Shepherd's Bush or round the Crystal Palace who were not dependent upon the Port of London, and whose livelihood did not depend upon it. He was bound to say that the County of Essex with its large shipping interests was more entitled to representation than the London County Council itself. Then it had been pointed out that the proposal contained in the Amendment was in no way in conflict with the principles of the Bill. In fact it was in accordance with the principle accepted by the Government themselves. He knew that the London County Council represented a more populous area at this moment, but he did not think that really affected the principle for which areas outside London were contending. It had been suggested that the Committee had in their mind the Liverpool example. The hon. Member for Nairn held that up as worthy of their adoption, and said that the counties of Lancashire and Cheshire on each side of the Mersey were fairly comparable with the counties of Essex and Kent on each side of the Thames. He had practical and personal knowledge not only of the River Thames but also of the River Mersey, and he ventured to say that if the hon. Member for Nairn would come down the river Thames with him he could convince him in a very short time that the view he took was entirely contrary to the facts and that they had on the shores of the Thames great manufacturing as well as shipping interests, wharves and other things, which entirely differentiated it from the state of things which existed along the Mersey. He could not help submitting to the President of the Board of Trade a point which had been made, and a very practical business point it was. It was that they already had an authority so large that its business could only be carried on by committees. That being so he believed it would actually add to the efficiency of the body, and enable them to carry out their work in different directions better, if they had an addition to their members and, therefore, had more men able to do committee work. The hon. Member for Nairn told them that Liverpool alone was represented on the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board; but there was a more modern precedent. It was only two or three years ago that a Bill was before the House dealing with a river much more analogous to the River Thames, viz., the River Clyde. When that Bill was before the House direct representation was given to all the authorities along the shore in order that they might have the opportunity of making their claims known. He thought it would be a very great advantage to the administration to have from the county of Essex, men who were living on the spot, and who were acquainted with the needs of the trades carried on on the shores of the Thames, and who were in constant touch with them. They would be of real practical value in the discussions of the authority; he believed equally, if not more, valuable than City men and representatives of great shipping companies who were to be the only persons to be allowed to be on the Port authority. Something had been said with regard to the interest of these counties in connection with sea walls. The President of the Board of Trade had suggested that in regard to sea walls there was some provision in the Bill which gave adequate protection in the case of damage. That was an entirely misleading suggestion. The clause the right hon. Gentleman had in his mind simply prevented a statutory defence being set up under this Act, in respect of any damage that might arise in consequence of dredging. But the point was this. Along the shores of the Thames there was a large population resident below high water mark, a population mostly consisting of men of small means, and if the walls were let down in consequence of dredging, and the property of these people was damaged, they really would have no remedy. They were poor men and could not afford the legal costs and the expense of getting the evidence of experts which it was so necessary to have when fighting a great corporation who could afford the very best counsel. So that the damage caused by the letting down of the sea wall was only provided against in theory. In actual fact it would give no protection at all. The only way these people could really be protected would be by having somebody on the authority who would see as far as it was possible that this important matter was not overlooked. He thought the claim of Essex was greater at this period of the evening than it was a few hours ago. The Government had rejected the claim for representation by the riverside manufacturers and the ships which used the river. Those two classes formed a very important element of the counties of Kent and Essex and if the President of the Board of Trade would only grant this concession asked for now he would go far to mitigate the hostility of the people in those parts to the Bill. There was a population of 500,000 resident in the districts on the river front, and the health of that population was a very important matter. Although the Essex county authority was the authority for health, the London County Council could and did discharge the effluent from their sewers into the water there, and whilst London would have several members on the authority to safeguard London's interests in this matter, no representative would be there from Essex to prevent an improper exercise of the London County Council powers. He was a strong supporter of the Government, and he wished to see this Bill passed; still he was constrained to ask the right hon. Gentleman now to consider the strong claim that is made on behalf of these counties.

Mr. BONAR LAW: I am sorry to break up the harmony of the Opposition in this matter, but I must say in this, I take the view of the Government. I say that in my personal capacity, however, and do not wish in any way to influence hon. Members behind me. The hon. Member who spoke last made what to me was a surprising statement which was that on the Clyde Board these outside bodies were represented. I think he will find that that is not the case.

Mr. WHITEHEAD: I took it from the evidence given before the Committee upstairs.

Mr. BONAR LAW: In that case I am wrong. I only spoke from memory. The hon. Gentleman who represents West Ham made the remark that in all his Parliamentary experience he had never seen such unanimity. I have had a little longer experience, and I have seen similar unanimity under similar circumstances. I have seen it between the Irish Unionist and Nationalist Parties when they all wanted the same thing. Every Member in this case wants representation for his own district. It is quite natural that they should, but that is no reason why the House should give it. It seems to me that the only valid argument put forward was that of the hon. Member for Kingston who said that as representation was given to the London County Council it ought to be given to other county councils. But there is this difference between the London County Council and the other county authorities, that if by any chance the port authority should not pay its way the interest of London in having a good port is so essential that the London County Council would have to step in and aid the port, and assist it in its finances. I do not think that is a contingency which is very likely to happen, but the London County Council are bound to take that step if it does, and I do not think any of the other authorities are in the same position. I do not think there is any magic in the number the Government has set up, and I am not sure that the addition of one or two more would not be an improvement, but I personally think the members of the Port authority should be drawn from the class that pays the dues, that the people who pay the expense should call the tune, and that the vote which is claimed by the hon. Member for Essex should come not through the county authorities but through the people who do the business. I therefore desire now to support the Government. We had the same difficulty before us some time ago, and we then came to the conclusion that it would not be to the interest of the Port authority to have the Board extended in the way that is suggested.

Mr. CHURCHILL: This discussion has now gone on for a considerable time, and those who have been in the Chamber during its progress will be able to judge of its merits. I do not quarrel with any of the speeches which have been made, or make any animadversion on the objects which those who made them have pursued. But are not the Committee fully convinced by the debate that all these proposals put forward, excellent as each may be in itself, are mutually destructive? If we are to safeguard the Port authority from being hampered and encumbered by a great number of localised representatives we must, even at the risk of appearing sullen and obdurate and grossly disobliging, stand firm, and keep the numbers of the authority to reasonably manageable proportions. I may point out this. The hon. Gentleman has just referred to the London County Council. It is quite true that the London County Council has been given representation and that the county authorities have not. But quite apart from the vital difference the hon. Member for Dulwich has pointed out, the London County Council is in quite a different position, is of quite a different character, and on a far different scale from these smaller authorities. The London County Council has a general and not a sectional interest in the Port authority. It will not be concerned in things in which a particular district or town has a particular interest. Its interest is a general interest. Its interest in the Port of London is not sectional in any degree. The same may be said of the Corporation which is in a different position also from these county authorities. The hon. Gentleman who represents Gravesend tells us we have also been inconsistent in giving a representative to Labour, whilst we oppose sectional interests. The use of the words "sectional interest" as applied to labour is subject to some reserve. When you consider the many thousands of men who are engaged under hard and sometimes evil conditions of casual labour, who are earning their daily bread at the docks, I do not think it can be said that they are a sectional interest in the same way that every class of trader is sectionally interested. Although I am quite ready to admit that the representation of Labour on a port authority is introduced into this Bill for the first time, I am perfectly certain it is defensible, because, although it is an interest of a particular class, that class is so large and its interests are so interwoven that it cannot be dismissed as wholly sectional; it is a human, moral, and national interest of a large and responsible character. That is the answer I would venture to make to the hon. Gentleman who made a most moderate and closely reasoned contribution to the debate—I mean the hon. Member for West Ham. If the claim of West Ham is put forward as geographical, it must take its chance with all the other geographical claims, and he knows perfectly well that the excellent arguments brought forward to show there was special reason to give a special member to West Ham were matched by excellent reasons brought forward by hon. Gentlemen opposite for giving a special member to Middlesex or Kent. If I rightly interpret the mood and intention of the hon. Gentleman, it is twofold. He wishes, no doubt, if he can, to secure a member for West Ham, but he is also concerned that the Labour interest of which his constituency is largely composed, shall be adequately represented on the Port authority. I agree. The Board of Trade have already pledged themselves that one of their representatives shall be appointed after proper consultation with the established representatives of Labour opinion, which I think is the most convenient method. I see an Amendment on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. Member for Rotherhithe proposing that one of the members nominated by the London County Council should be similarly appointed after consultation with or from the recognised Labour organisations. The Government will be sympathetic in their attitude towards that Amendment when it is brought on; and, if the House and the Government were to take the course advocated by the hon. Member for Rotherhithe, I should like to point out that that would to some extent give effect to the views we have heard so often expressed during the discussion, that the County Council representation is excessive—a view I do not share. Still I am not at all disposed to think the County Council would be hampered in its influence upon the authority if it were to look towards the representatives of Labour in that respect. May I now respectfully ask the Committee whether we cannot come to a conclusion on the general question of the size of the authority? Everyone who has spoken has had a plan by which that authority might be extended and improved. Our proposal is bluntly and clearly to remain at ten appointed members. We think to increase that would be to make the authority more cumbersome and less adapted for its purpose. We think that to admit the claim of one local authority and deny it to others, would be to increase the injustice to the others without substantially introducing greater modification or indulgence into the Bill. Finally, we venture strongly to urge upon the House the undesirability of increasing the proportion of appointed members beyond the limit which has already been fixed to elected members and which the Committee which examined it considered to be excessive even as it stands.

*MR. MORTON said he quite agreed with his hon. friend who represented a portion of the County of Essex. It would have been much better if the Second Reading had not been closured and they had had an opportunity of discussing the question generally. Knowing something about the working of the river, he sympathised very much with the hon. Gentleman who wished to get more representatives of the consumers and not of the mere payer of dues. It was found that the smallness of the old Metropolitan Board practically ruined it. Having, as a member of the Thames Conservancy, carefully watched and viewed the river from the Nore to Cricklade, he was bound to say that those hon. Gentlemen who represented the towns and county councils on the present Conservancy Board were among the best members they had. They had first to be elected to their own town or county council and then afterwards they were selected, apparently on acount of their knowledge of matters connected with the Port of London. That being his opinion, he strongly sympathised with those hon. Gentlemen who wished to see Kent, Essex, or any other district bounding on the river represented. He quite agreed that the London County Council ought to be strongly represented on a body of this sort. He wished to say that openly and honestly. No doubt the old Corporation ought to be represented too. The people of London owned the freehold of the Thames from Staines down to Southend; they had a big money interest in it, and it was only fair to say they ought to be represented. He was glad that had been recognised, but he still thought that those who were going to pay the money should have more representatives on the Board.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said there was something pathetic in listening to one Member after another claiming representation for his own constituency as if he were claiming something important or useful for London. Experience showed that this kind of representation was altogether illusory and completely futile. There was no doubt that experience with the Thames Conservancy and Metropolitan Water Board showed that a man nominated on a great body of this kind in the manner proposed to be done under this Bill did not go there to do any work or for any useful purpose at all. The office was conferred as a kind of honour upon an elderly gentleman.

MR. MORTON expressed dissent.

MR. RADFORD said he made no aspersion on his hon. friend the Member for Sutherland. He was perpetually young. That was what happened. The man went on to the Board not to do any work. He regarded the proceedings with a languid interest and went back home to his friends in his own suburban district, and said he was a member of the Port authority of London.

*MR. MORTON: As the hon. Member has referred to me, I should like to say that the corporation put me on the Thames Conservancy as an active member on purpose to look after them.

*MR. RADFORD said his hon. friend was an exception to all rules. It was proposed to have representatives of the London County Council, the Corporation of the City, the Admiralty, and the Board of Trade. Why on earth some of those bodies were introduced he could not for the life of him imagine. It was of no use to the Port of London and would not contribute to the efficiency or usefulness of the body they were setting up. He found himself in this matter in a position to support the Government, and he hoped they would consider whether they could not usefully reduce the number of appointed members on the Port authority and pay no attention to the arguments addressed to them. When the appointed members had been largely reduced in number and the constitution of the elected members had been vastly improved, then, and not until then, might this be a useful measure.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 373.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey of (Isle Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. H.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Bull, Sir William James
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston, S
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Keswick, William
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thornton, Percy M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clynes, J. R.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Fletcher, J. S.
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gretton, John
Guiness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renwick, George
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Walsh, Stephen
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Colonel Warde and Mr. Whitehead.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham) moved to leave out the word "two," the number of the nominees of the Board of Trade, in order to insert the word "three." The Amendment was not moved in order to increase the number of ten, but as consequential on an Amendment to leave out the representative of Trinity House. He failed to see on what grounds it was proposed that Trinity House should have a representative on the Port authority. The functions of Trinity House would not be interfered with. It was a body which no one knew very much about, and which was certainly not representative, and he could not see in what way it could claim to have a statutory right to appoint a representative on the port authority of London. If the Amendment were accepted it would be perfectly open to the Board of Trade to do with its nominee anything that it was possible for Trinity House to do. It was quite possible, for instance, if the Board of Trade came to the conclusion that there ought to be a gentleman possessing the special knowledge which Trinity House would have, to sub-let one of its nominations. That was the way in which Manchester had obtained a representative on the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. It might be said that Trinity House ought to have a representative because they conducted the lighting and piloting of London, but it did not seem to him that that was a sound argument at all. The argument was the opposite way. If there was any connection between the Port authority and Trinity House on account of lighting and pilotage it was not for Trinity House to be represented, but that the Port authority ought to help Trinity House. That seemed to be the logical conclusion. If the special knowledge possessed by Trinity House was not required there was in the hands of the Board of Trade another nomination which it would be possible to put at the disposal of any body which was not represented.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'two,' and to insert the word 'three.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the clause."

MR. CHURCHILL: I was not under any illusion as to the purpose of my hon. friend's Amendment. I did not think it was intended to be a compliment to the Board of Trade. Had it presented itself in that light I should have been very much tempted to accept it. But I recognised very early in the day that my hon. friend had an ulterior design in moving the Amendment, and that it was part of the general proposal which has been placed by various Members on the Paper to remove the Trinity House altogether from any connection with the Port authority, if not indeed to abolish that institution. I trust the Committee will not attempt to put an end to the existence of Trinity House at present. Trinity House was not heard in evidence on the subject of the Bill, and I think it would be exceedingly unfair to strike at it as the result of any of these Amendments cursorily introduced into the Bill. Trinity House will have the conduct and the lighting of the Port of

London in the Bill as we contemplated, and that being so, it is most extraordinary that it should not have a representative on the Port authority. It is essential that it should have a representative on the Port authority. All the Commissions recommended it, and all the previous Bills, I understand, accorded it, and I am bound to say that I do not think any serious injury can result from the authority which is specially charged with the duty of lighting the whole, not only of the Port of London, but the general approaches of the river, having a right to appoint a member. We can quote in support of this arrangement not only the opinion of the Joint Committee, but the recommendation of almost all previous bodies who have approached the consideration of this subject. Therefore the Board of Trade feel at the present juncture that two members are sufficient for them, that they will resist, partly from prudence and partly from modesty, the gift, however complimentary, which the hon. Gentleman desires to bestow upon them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER supported the President of the Board of Trade in his contention and opposed the Amendment of the hon. Member. The President of the Board of Trade and the Government had been quite clear regarding one thing. They had said: "We want to give all the interests representation, but we do not wish to give them sectional representation. We want the manufacturers and the wharfingers and every class of people interested in the Thames to be represented, but we do not wish to give sectional representation." There was one class of men who were entirely left out of any representation at all, even by this wide clause, and in the Schedule which the right hon. Gentleman had added to the Bill. They proposed arrangements by which in regard to voting for election to the Port authority, the voter would be allowed to vote for a number of candidates in order of preference or otherwise, in order to secure that so far as possible the several interests concerned should be adequately represented. The Government contended, of course, that that covered the ground of the general interest, and that their aim was to give all the interests representation. But Trinity House represented not only a very large number of pilots, but also a large class of men who would become pilots eventually, and by no means would these men be represented except through Trinity House. The Port authority would require its special and technical knowledge, and its position ought to be preserved upon the authority, not alone because of its technical knowledge, but because it represented a body of men who had no other means of expressing their interests under the Bill. Therefore, he gave his unhesitating support to the President of the Board of Trade, and his opposition to the Amendment.

MR. HOLT: If the President of the Board of Trade really sticks to his arrangement, I do not want to waste the time of the Committee, and I ask leave to withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. E. H. LAMB said that in order to secure a fair share of representation on this body for Kent, he desired to move to leave out the words "Trinity House," in order to insert, "the Kent County Council."

*MR. STEADMAN asked if his Amendment (to substitute "six" for "two" as the number of representatives to be appointed by the London County Council from outside its own body) was out of order, and, if not, whether it should not take priority over this Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's Amendment is not in order because he does not move to omit any other four nominees, and if his Amendment were carried it would exceed the number of ten which the Committee has already agreed to.

*MR. STEADMAN pointed out that one hon. Member had already been allowed to move an Amendment to delete "two," and insert "three."

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's Amendment is not in order because it would exceed ten.

MR. E. H. LAMB, resuming, said the President of the Board of Trade finished his speech by saying that the policy of the Government, bluntly and squarely, was to have ten appointed members, and ten only. As that was the position, they must, of course, bow to the inevitable, but he wanted the Committee to consider who should have this last representative among the appointed members. The Corporation of Trinity House seemed to have some enchantment for the Committee, but he would like to remind the Committee of the composition of that body. Leaving out the members of the Royal Family, of whom there were three, there was first of all the name of Lord Rosebery. He thought His Majesty's Government would agree with him that the noble Earl had quite sufficient scope for his energy in dealing with matters in another place, without having his time taken up with the appointment of one of the members of this new authority. Another member of the Trinity House Corporation was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, whose absence from the House of Commons they all greatly deplored. Another member was the Leader of the Opposition, and the list also included Lord Selborne, Lord George Hamilton, who at one time was an excellent Member of the House representing Ealing; Prince Louis of Battenberg, and others he need not mention. All he wished to emphasise was the fact that the Trinity House Corporation was composed of such men as these, and he wished to know whether His Majesty's Government, speaking through the President of the Board of Trade, were serious in asserting that these gentlemen were more entitled to representation than the county of Kent, which embraced nearly a million acres, and contained a population of over one million. The county of Kent was likely to be very seriously affected by the dredging operations which might be carried on by the new Port authority. He noticed that the hon. Member for the Kirkdale division had an Amendment in Clause 11, to insert—

> "As from the appointed day there shall be vested in the Port authority the management and control of buoying, beaconing, and lighting of the Port of London and estuary of the Thames."

He did not know whether the President of the Board of Trade was going to accept that Amendment or not?

MR. CHURCHILL: No.

MR. E. H. LAMB said that, having got that assurance from the right hon. Gentleman, he would not press his Amendment.

*MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe) moved to insert the words "and one of the members of the Port authority appointed by the London County Council shall be appointed by the Council after consultation with such organisations representative of labour as the Council think best qualified to advise them in the matter." He wished to thank the President of the Board of Trade for the kindly reference he made to his Amendment and he would not detain the Committee for many minutes. He wished, however, to point out that the object of the Amendment was to strengthen the Port authority and make it one which would have the thorough support and confidence of the workers all over the Port of London. This was very important, because under Clause 27 the Port of London had some special functions to perform. He might be told that the new body would be a business organisation consisting of business men. In reply to that he wished to point out that the tendency in modern industrial undertakings was to associate labour with the control of the business. This was especially important in the case of this new authority for the Port of London. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech on the Second Reading of the Bill, impressed upon the House the importance of having any labour question that might arise threshed out in the board room to begin with before it arose in the nature of a big complication and heated quarrel outside, and if labour had two or three representatives on the Port authority, any trouble of that kind would be brought before it first of all by the labour representative. He thought it was most important that this Port authority should be able to carry out the work in a harmonious manner, and his object in bringing forward this Amendment was to strengthen the Port authority. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'and one of the members of the port authority appointed by the London County Council shall be appointed by the Council after consultation with such organisations representative of labour as the Council think best qualified to advise them in the matter.'"—(*Mr. Carr-Gomm.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.

MR. CHURCHILL: After the observations which I ventured to address to the Committee earlier in the debate, I do not think it will be expected that I should reply at any length to this Amendment. I am bound to say that I do not believe that the arguments are by any means all on one side in this matter. There are no labour representatives on any other Port authority in the United Kingdom. When the case of the County Council came to be considered the Committee took away one of their members and transferred it to another quarter. I confess to having some slight misgivings as to the transference we are now asked to make, but on the other hand I feel strongly that the labour interests which are associated with the working of this great port, including the great question of casual labour and all the extraordinary difficulties associated with that question, which up to the present have baffled all social experiments and organisation, and the question also of the possibility of labour disputes and the importance of strengthening sympathetic relations between the two great parties to production—all those considerations in the case of London, in my opinion, justify a case for some extension of the principle of representation to the class of manual labourers. I think there is a case for that, although there are disadvantages which I do not underrate a bit. I believe I shall be interpreting the general wish of the Committee if, on behalf of the Government, I accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman, leaving it possible for reconsideration on Report—though this is a matter which I only state with some hesitancy—whether the extra member who will go to represent the labour interest should necessarily be drawn from this particular source. That we may think over when we are going over the Bill a second time on Report, but for the present I accept the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he did not rise in any way to make a violent speech, or indeed a partisan speech against the Amendment which had from many points of view the sympathy of everybody in the House, but he confessed that he really regretted the precipitancy with which the Government had accepted it. After all, let them carefully consider what they were constituting. They were going to constitute a body for the management of one of the greatest industrial undertakings in the whole country, and the Government had occupied the first hour of the proceedings in saying that they wished to secure the best possible heads in London to manage that great undertaking. They addressed a very successful appeal to the Committee not in any way to hamper the choice of the very best people. He did not at all deny that it might turn out that the London County Council would desire to select a labour man as one of their representatives, but ought they not to leave the thing quite free? Why should they fetter the discretion and the choice of the London County Council in this matter any more than in any other? The President of the Board of Trade said that the interests of labour were so great in this matter that they ought to have a representative. Surely that was not the point. That was not the real way of looking at it. The labour interest in this as in everything was the same as everybody else's interest. There was no real distinction between the two. It might be short-sighted of employers to lose sight of this obvious truth; but everyone who considered it must see that the interests of labour and the interests of employers were identical, for the prosperity of an undertaking depended upon both sides. Therefore, he distrusted this kind of suggestion of the President of the Board of Trade that there were interests of labour which were antagonistic to or not identical with——

MR. CHURCHILL: That is really not my suggestion. What I said was that there are problems of labour to the solution of which even on a body like the new Port of London authority a representative of labour would be able to bring special knowledge.

LORD R. CECIL said that if the only object was to have someone there to inform the governing authority what was desirable from the point of view of labour, then he must point out that the Bill now provided for one representative of labour. The President of the Board of Trade had justly said that it was a great experiment. It was a novel idea, and he thought it was right that it should be tried. He was glad to see it in the Bill. The question was whether it was desirable that it should be carried out in the way proposed.

MR. CHURCHILL: You must also remember that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer held out an expectation. He did not mention any figure definitely, but his expression has been interpreted as meaning that labour will at least have two representatives.

LORD R. CECIL said that that was a different point and he did not pretend to carry in his mind all the pledges which the Government had given on this and other subjects. It seemed to him that they were already bound to do this, and there was an unnecessary display of impartiality on the part of the President of the Board of Trade when he said the Government would accept the Amendment. Having said that, the right hon. Gentleman said he was not quite sure whether the Government would be able to accept it in this form or not. The Committee had nothing at all to do with the pledges of the Government. He asked the Committee to consider rather carefully whether, when trying an experiment, it was not better to try it on a modest scale at first. If the experiment succeeded there would be no difficulty in extending it. It would be extended naturally and automatically because the County Council, which was a popularly-elected body dealing essentially with the interests of the pulic, would be the first people anxious and willing to extend it and to select one of their number. If the experiment failed, and if they imposed two members of an inefficient character on the Port authority, so far from doing any good to labour they would be really doing it harm. There was another argument to which he wished to refer. The right hon. Gentleman said it might be desirable to have labour thoroughly well represented on the Port authority because in the case of any labour dispute the labour representative might be helpful. He entirely concurred with that as a general principle. The right hon. Gentleman must recollect that both the Board of Trade and the County Council representatives would not be elected by the working classes. There had been many successful experiments tried in industrial undertakings where the working classes had been enabled to elect directors of these undertakings. But in those cases the workingmen chose their representatives and they were the representative mouthpieces of the working men. If they selected labour representatives through the London County Council or the Board of Trade the position was a very different one, and not nearly so favourable to the success of the experiment. He did not wish to oppose the Amendment, but he confessed he would have been better pleased if the Government had said that they would consider the matter carefully and had not acted so precipitately as they had done in accepting an Amendment so far-reaching in its character.

*MR. STEADMAN said he knew that one had to be thankful for small mercies, and he was thankful to the noble Lord for the half-hearted manner in which he had supported the Amendment. He could assure the noble Lord that hundreds of thousands of working men were anxiously looking forward to the passing of this Bill. Men of his class were always mistrusted. They could afford to ignore that. It was like pouring water on a duck's back. Working men had their co-operative societies, friendly societies, benefit societies, and trade unions in this country as living monuments of the administrative ability of the industrial classes. The River Thames was the staple industry of this vast metropolis. It was not only the workmen in the docks and on the riverside who were interested in the administration of the Port of London, but the proposals now before the Committee involved the bread and butter of thousands of workmen spread over the whole of London whose industries depended on the success or failure of the Port. They had a dock strike some years ago, of which the President of the Local Government Board could tell them something. He was sure the noble Lord did not wish to see a repetition of that. What was the Government doing? He admitted that they were setting up a principle for the first time, but it was a principle which they could defend inside and outside. It was a principle that would inspire confidence among the thousands of workmen who were employed in the docks. Quite likely—more likely than not—it would mean the prevention of many a trade dispute which would otherwise occur. That was his experience in connection with the London County Council, and they were the largest employers of labour, with the exception of the Government, in the country. He had faith in the London County Council when he was a member. If this Amendment was accepted, the County Council would be bound to put one labour representative on the Port of London authority. He said in all sincerity that he shared the views of the late President of the Board of Trade and the present President in their anxiety to secure the best representative men available for this board. He could select six men—they might call them agitators; he did not care what they called them—secretaries of trade unions, whose members were working on the River Thames, who knew ten times more about the river than the men the Board of Trade would select in making the appointments to the board. They were the people they wanted on the Port authority, although he had heard slurs cast upon them. If there was a little more confidence between the industrial classes and the employing classes in the country, it would be better for the prosperity of both, and of the country at large.

Mr. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said he had an Amendment on the Paper in the same terms as that now proposed, and he begged to thank the President of the Board of Trade for having accepted it He hardly found himself in agreement with all that the noble Lord had said as to this Amendment. The noble Lord had accused the Government of precipitancy in accepting the Amendment, but six months ago the principle of direct labour representation was accepted by the then President of the Board of Trade, who said that he thought there should be one, two, or three representatives of labour on the Port authority, so that the noble Lord could not charge the Government with acting precipitately in the matter. In constituting this authority the object to be aimed at was to get the best men, and the County Council would take care that the men selected by them were the best to represent the largest interest concerned in the Port authority. The noble Lord had said that they would not be elected by the working men.

Lord R. CECIL: All I said was that they would not be selected by the working men themselves. I was comparing this representation with the representatives elected directly in great industrial concerns.

Mr. W. BENN said that personally he thought there was a great deal to be said for the direct election of the labour representatives. The noble Lord had said they had got one representative of labour, and surely that was enough for an experiment. He was inclined to think that the experiment was likely to be more successful if they had two representatives rather than one. The Port authority was to have its own procedure. Supposing that no proposition could be discussed unless there was a seconder, and the representative of labour brought in a proposal directed against the interest of capital, and could not find a seconder. He would then be unable to raise the matter. Again, the Port authority had to set up a number of committees. They were not paying the members of this authority, and it would be difficult, if there was only one working man representative, who had to earn his own living, for him to sit on these committees. From these two points of view he thought it was an excellent thing to have two labour representatives instead of one. Another important point was that the labour interests of the Port of London were quite as varied as those of capital. The labourers were divided into certain distinct interests—the lightermen, who were the aristocracy amongst the labourers, the stevedores, who were the middle class, and the dockers, who were the poorest; and they looked at many things in different ways. In dealing with these classes it was a great advantage to have the representatives of labour capable of taking a wide view, not only of the interest of the class they represented but of the interest of all the classes engaged in the port. The first job which the authority would have to undertake would be the regulation of casual labour, and hon. Members well knew that the representatives of the workmen often gave totally different evidence. The representatives of the lightermen and the stevedores were satisfied with the present system, and the representatives of the dockers wanted almost a revolutionary change. It would be greatly to the advantage of the labourers as a whole if the representation was not confined exclusively to one section. As to the future, he had not the slightest doubt that the great advantage of having representatives of labour on the Port authority would be the avoidance of strikes and misunderstandings. These disputes were much more likely to be avoided if there were more than one representative of labour. If there was only one he would be often placed in a difficult and rather invidious position. If there were two, the workers themselves would have much greater confidence in their representation. From the employers' point of view it would be a great advantage to have more than one representative, because every representative of labour was a missionary of peace, and in the case of disputes it would be a great advantage to have working men on the Board to explain to their fellows exactly what was going on. He wished again to thank the President of the Board of Trade most heartily for securing this representation of labour, and he could assure him that he had done something to promote the well-being and efficiency of the Port of London.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he did not think that there was any objection to have one representative of labour as originally proposed. He agreed with his noble friend that there was just the danger of over representation of labour in this particular portion of the Port authority—dealing with the nominated members, which was the permanent portion of the authority. It seemed to him that the Government might well rely on the democratic feeling that existed among all the interests that were to be represented on the authority under subsection (5). There was no reason why among the eighteen elected members there should not be one, two, or perhaps more who were directly representative of labour. It seemed to him that the Government had not thought really of the possibility of labour being unduly represented through the ordinary form of election. He called the attention of the Committee to the possible composition of the ten nominated members. He assumed that the Government in making the appointment of these ten had covered the general interest of the Port. Naturally they secured the appointment of a representative of the Admiralty, who would cover the Naval interest. Then the Board of Trade would naturally be represented by representatives of commerce and industry in the widest sense. The municipal interest in its most general sense was clearly intended to be represented by the members chosen by the London County Council and the City Corporation, while the purely technical and professional interest, with traditional knowledge of the river, which belonged to Trinity House, would be represented by the member chosen by Trinity House. He thought in these circumstances that to give one direct representative of labour was as much as the Government ought to be called upon to do. Therefore, although he was naturally sympathetic to the representation of labour in these eighteen elected members, he was opposed to a double representation of labour which would necessarily crowd out one of the very important interests to which he had already referred. Therefore he felt bound to support the Amendment.

*Mr. NAPIER thought the whole House would desire to have on the Port authority labour represented by one or two members, but the true way to do this was either by the method suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the early part of the debate, or by leaving the County Council unfettered discretion to elect a representative of labour. He objected to the Amendment, not because he objected to labour representation, but because it unduly fettered the discretion of the County Council, and in doing that, the Government were setting an exceedingly bad precedent. He felt very strongly that in accepting this Amendment the right hon. Gentleman had taken a step which was not really and truly democratic, but which tended to class representation.

*Mr. MORTON said he was sorry to find there was opposition to this Amendment. The objection to the proposal to get labour better represented on the Port authority would be well understood out of doors.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he was in a very considerable difficulty about this nomination, because everybody said that the members of this body ought to be elected on a democratic basis. This was starting all wrong, because if they began with a nomination they could not have a democratic basis. Then the hon. Member for Gravesend had said there was possibility of a labour man being on the body. What they, in that part of the House, meant by a labour man was a man connected with trade unions or labour organisations apart from a man of commerce. The hon. Member said they were likely to be selected, but surely that could not be so. What was going to happen? Were they going to be elected by payers of dues, owners of river craft, and wharfingers? Did anyone think that even so respectable a man as his hon. friend the Member for Finsbury could get a vote from one of them? The constituency which sent them there would not consist of wharfingers alone, and they would be voted against in the constituency. Let them not talk about democratic basis; it did not come in there; it did not work out. But why put this particular one on from the London County Council and also one from the Corporation? What a delightful thing it would be if the Corporation would elect him! Why should not the City of London have a labour member? It was about time. It was a reason why he should be elected that they promoted City Guilds and institutions of that sort. In regard to the Amendment, what would happen was that the Council would simply choose the man they wanted and put him up to represent labour. If they said, however, that this man should be selected by a labour group or be a paid official of a labour organisation he was willing. But that was what would not happen.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is so.

Mr. CROOKS: You are going to consult an organised labour group. I hope that will be put in.

Mr. CHURCHILL: That will be put in.

Mr. CROOKS said they would have to be careful, because if they got in a docker the stevedores would be jealous. If, however, they were going to consult trade union organisations there was no reason why the Amendment should not be carried.

The Amendment agreed to.

*Mr. MORTON proposed to leave out subsection (9) and insert "The Port authority shall set apart such sum not exceeding in any year £2,100 as the Port authority, with the approval of the Board of Trade, thinks fit, and shall divide the same among the members of the Port authority as they from time to time think fit." He wanted to provide that the Port authority might pay its chairman, vice-chairman, or chairman of committees, or others any salary within the limit mentioned in the Amendment as it might determine. He desired that these monies should not go to the chairmen of the Port authority alone but should be divided among the members of the body, in a somewhat similar method to that carried on by the Thames Conservancy. His proposal was democratic. It was not quite Socialistic because he did not propose to make an equal distribution of the money. On the Thames Conservancy they used to give the chairman £500 a year out of the money, and the rest of it was divided among the members, but always according to attendance. Nobody had any money unless they worked. They got a fresh chairman a few years back; they appointed Lord Desborough. They reduced his salary to £300, not necessarily because he was a Lord but they did reduce it and divided the rest among those who attended, after paying £100 per annum to the chairman of committees. He thought that was a much better arrangement than giving it all to the chairman. He did not think that anybody for a moment could contend that it would be reasonable to expect the majority of the members of this Port authority to do the work, and for the chairman to take the money, or practically all of it, and, therefore, to his mind it was much more fair and democratic to divide it as he had suggested. He knew some people would say: "You should not let them have any money at all." That would apply equally, of course, to the chairman of the Board and the chairman of committees, because they had no more right to get money than the ordinary members. It was only fair and right that gentlemen who gave up two or three days a week should be paid. He dared say he could find an excellent lot of gentlemen to occupy the front Treasury bench without any salaries at all, but they paid the Members of the Government salaries, some of them very large ones, and some were wanting more, but there was just as much reason for paying members of this Board for their attendance as there was for paying officials who represented the Government in the House of Commons. Therefore he had always thought that it was only fair and right that gentlemen who were willing to give their services and a great deal of their time should be paid. If they did their duty on a board of this sort they must give up a great deal of time as they should go and inspect everything. Otherwise they could not look after the men or anthing else concerned with the management. Unless the masters were continually inspecting and visiting the work so as to let everybody know they were looking about, it would not be kept straight. If they paid the chairman and not the others, the business might be left entirely to the chairman, and then they got the worst sort of government they could have, because one-man goverment nearly always failed. He trusted the Committee would see its way to agree to this proposal. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out subsection (9), and to insert the words "(9) The Port authority shall set apart such sum not exceeding in a year two thousand one hundred pounds, as the Port authority with the approval of the Board of Trade thinks fit, and shall divide the same among the members of the Port authority as they from time to time think fit.—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question put, "That the words of the subsection down to 'vice-chairman,' in line 27, stand part of the clause."

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not think this would be a very good arrangement. It is a great question whether members of these public or *quasi* public bodies should be paid. It is another question of importance whether the chairman should be paid, and another question whether the chairman of committees ought to be paid. I do not know that it is any solution of either of these questions to take £2,100 and divide it in sums of £60 or £70 among a body of twenty-eight business men, whose time would be valuable, and who would not be attracted by this remuneration. I do not think that is consonant with the dignity or efficiency of this new Port authority. The sum of money seems to bear no relation whatever either to what is necessary to get people to serve on such a body, or what can be considered an adequate remuneration of their services. I am well aware that a similar principle has been adopted upon the Thames Conservancy, and I am not at all sure that it has been in every respect attended by results that have altogether eliminated from the area of the operations of that body any ground of complaint. I venture to think that the much more reasonable way is to pay people adequate salaries for responsible executive work which they have to discharge, and which will absorb the whole of their time, as in the case of the chairman or chairmen of committees, and if any payment should be made to other members it should take the form more of reimbursements for out-of-pocket expenses than this sort of arbitrary or capricious *douceur* which is distributed among the members *en bloc*. A very noticeable thing is the opinion which the London County Council have formed as to the principles at present in vogue on the Thames Conservancy. They do not allow their members who are members and officials of that body to take that £70 a year; it is paid into the general funds of the London County Council. I think that does indicate in a very remarkable way the opinion which has been forced upon this large public body in regard to such matters as this. I am bound to say I wish to treat the hon. Gentleman's Amendment with all respect, but I do not think that the House will find from any point of view that it is a practical or convenient arrangement. I, therefore, trust that we may be permitted to adhere to our plan in the Bill which is to pay substantial salaries to the persons whose services must be almost wholly absorbed in the work and to allow the Port authority to have in the management of their business the same sort of discretion as the private bodies which they are going to supersede. I hope they will not pay more than is necessary, but they will have to pay people who give the whole of their time. If any other payment is required, let it be proportionate, and let it be only for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses.

*SIR A. SPICER totally disagreed with his hon. friend in the Amendment he had moved. He thought the Committee had studied economy quite sufficiently in the clause now under consideration. He would not be in the least surprised if experience showed that they had to pay more money in the way of salaries to the members. After all the new Port authority would be called upon to administer a trust the capital sum of which would be over £20,000,000, and he very much doubted with all the claims made upon our ablest men in London, whether they would be able to obtain sufficient strength without paying more than was contemplated in this section. It must be remembered that they would not hand over to the new Port authority a business that could be run through with comparatively little time on the part of those who were going to administer it. They were handing over to the Port authority a great enterprise which would want all their powers of administration to make it a success. He believed it could be made a real success, but it would have to be carried out by men who were not going to play with the matter, and who would give a large part of their time and strength to this great enterprise. Therefore, he ventured to point out that the Committee must not be surprised when the new authority commenced to work if it came back and said: "If you want us to do the work properly we must get the right men and must be prepared to pay a higher remuneration."

MR. BARNARD said he found from the section on which this Amendment was based that, subject to the provision of the section, they might appoint a chairman and vice-chairman who need not be an appointed or elected member. He wanted to ask why a distinction was made between the Port of London and the Thames Conservancy.

SIR H. KEARLEY: The hon. Member asks why the distinction between the Port of London and the Thames Conservancy?

MR. BARNARD said he was referring to page 9. At the point under discussion it said they might appoint a chairman, a vice-chairman, and chairmen of other committees, and then he turned to page 9, and he found nobody but the chairman might be appointed.

SIR H. KEARLEY (who was imperfectly heard) was understood to say: The reason why we only put the chairman in the case of the up-river board, and why we put chairman, vice-chairman and chairmen of committees into the Port authority I should have thought was obvious to everybody. The down-river authority is an extremely important board. The up-river board is, of course, important, but the Port authority is a great trading board, dealing with great commercial interests, which the up-river board does not. The hon. Member proposes that all the members should be paid approximately about £70 a year each. I put this question to the Committee. We have talked to-night about the desirability of attracting the best men to this Port authority. Does any hon. Member think £70 a year is likely to attract the best men? The probability is that it would attract the class of men we do not want to see there. We take provision in the Bill to pay the chairman, vice-chairman and chairmen of committees at the option of the authority. In discussing this matter among ourselves at the time the Bill was being framed we saw very clearly that on a board of this kind it might be necessary to pay a really substantial salary to the chairman, vice-chairman and chairmen of committees. For example, there are those who have great experience in the administration of docks, and we could only obtain their services by means of a substantial salary. I have in my mind men whom we should be very desirous to have, who certainly could not afford to come on the board as ordinary unpaid members, but who would be of great advantage to the board as chairmen or vice-chairmen. There must, of necessity, be several committees set up, one to deal with the administration of the river, one to deal with the administration of the docks, and so on. I am perfectly certain that when this new authority is set up it will have to be composed of men who will devote themselves continuously to this work, and we shall not get the extremely important assistance of these men without paying them a substantial salary. I hope after this explanation my hon. friend will not press this Amendment.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) said the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Parliamentary-Secretary had had a rather curious effect upon him, because he was prepared to support the Government till he heard the hon. Gentleman. Among other things he said the effect of paying a man £70 per year would be to attract to the Board a very undesirable person from his point of view. Under subsection (5) of Clause 1 the only persons who would be attracted were persons elected by payers of dues, wharfingers, and owners of river craft. The hon. Gentleman in his long experience of business in the City of London must know very well that the payers of dues, wharfingers, and owners of river craft were not the people to elect undesirable men who might put up, so that that argument was absurd. Then the hon. Gentleman said he had somebody in his mind who would be attracted by a big salary. It at once occurred to him that there was a job here. He would much prefer that the Parliamentary-Secretary should get that gentleman out of his mind and put him in the Bill so that they might know who and what kind of man he had in view. Under those circumstances, he had much pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

*MR. MORTON said he did not know that it would be necessary for him to go to a division, but he would like to say a few words in reply to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. He had reminded them that the members appointed by the London County Council were not allowed to take their fees, but all those gentlemen were sorry they were not allowed to take them. It was an amusing state of things. These gentlemen came to them politically and asked them to pledge themselves to the payment of members; and, when an attempt was made pay them, they were so pure they could not take a fee. The only objection they were told was that people would be hunting about to get £60 or £70 a year. They were not very likely to do that. What they would do would be to hunt about to get £1,000 or £2,000 a year, and in all probability those appointments would be filled by politicians and not by anybody who understood the work at all. That was why one should be careful how he supported the clause as it stood in the Bill. He could not understand the Government objecting to the payment of the ordinary members of this authority or any other similar body, because they were pledged to the payment of Members of Parliament. It was most extraordinary. For many and various reasons, they supported the payment of Members, but when they had a proposal before them in concrete form they said: "Oh no." Having given the best consideration he could to the matter, he did not think it necessary to put the Committee to the trouble of a division, although he was practically certain the Committee was really with him in the matter. Possibly they might think the Bill would never come into force, and that it was not worth troubling about that night. At any rate he did not want to put the Members to the trouble of going through the division lobby. Therefore, he asked leave to withdraw.

Leave to withdraw refused.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HOLT moved to amend the section in the sense of giving the authority power to pay the chairman and vice-chairman, but taking away the power as regards the chairmen of committees. He did not want to see the chairman or vice-chairman paid, and he would be very glad to know that the Board of Trade would make a very determined effort to procure a chairman or vice-chairman who would accept the positions without any payment whatever. He was perfectly certain from his own experience in Liverpool that, if they wanted to get the best men—as he was sure they all did—they were more likely to do so by making a determined effort to get men to serve on the authority without payment for the sake of the town and the trade of the port. He supposed it was no exaggeration to say that the chairmen of committees would number seven or eight, and allowing for the chairman and vice-chairman of the authority that would mean approximately that one member in three would receive payment. It was quite illusory to suppose they could pay the chairman of one committee and not the chairman of another. There would be jealousy among the committees. Not only would the chairman of committee A. want to receive the same as the chairman of committee B., but the members of committee A. would regard it as a slur upon them if their chairman did not receive the same as the chairman of committee B. If the proposal therefore were adopted, it would involve the payment of about one-third of the authority. He supposed they might assume that the payment to the chairman of committees would be something like £300 per year if anything at all. He thought that would not be an unfair guess as to the salary that would be paid. If they had these jobs going at £300 per year, kindly disposed men would say: "Who is there who wants £300 a year and a decent job? Who is rather hard up? Let us put him in the position." He was certain from his experience that that was the very first thing that would be done. They would put into the positions of chairmen of committees, not the best men, but the men on the committees who stood most in need of £300. That would be the practical upshot. The appointments would become a sort of old-age pensions for needy and unsuccessful merchants. He thought, therefore, it would be a great mistake to give the authority power to pay the chairmen of committees at all. The Members on the Treasury Bench, in speaking on the last Amendment, rather exaggerated the amount of work that would have to be done by the chairmen of committees. He was chairman of one of the committees of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and his experience was that it meant three hours work over and above what one would otherwise have had to do. The real hard detailed work was all done by the permanent officials, and he only gave directions as to lines of policy from the committee. If, as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade said, it was necessary to take over from the existing dock companies some experienced men who could not be got without a large salary they must be taken over as a permanent body of officials of the Harbour Authority. Lastly, he would like to ask hon. Members to consider what were likely to be the feelings of the other members of the committee working under this chairman. They would feel either that he was the servant of the committee or that they were in some way in an inferior position to him. He would therefore very earnestly beg the Board of Trade to accept his Amendment, and see if they could not go further and give some kind of pledge that they would make a determined effort to set up the Port Authority on the lines of the members not being paid, and only to pay the chairman and vice-chairman in the case of the worst and last necessity.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 27, after the word 'Chairman,' to insert the word 'and.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: I hope the Committee will notice that this power is an enabling power and not a compulsory one. No one says the port authority is to pay its chairman or vice-chairman, but if they think it necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the great responsibility they are inheriting to make such payments it ought not to be withheld from their discretion to do so. Personally, I entirely agree with much that has been said by my hon. friend in moving the Amendment. I think there are many advantages in honorary service being given on these great public bodies. At the same time I respectfully ask the Committee to remember that we are taking over the whole of the docks of London, which are now managed by private companies pursuing their own private interests and the interests of their shareholders with their opportunities and with their obligations. We are consolidating them into one solid mass and vesting it in the charge of a combined Port authority. That is a great operation, and any one who cares about collective ownership, about the efficiency of a *quasi* public authority, as compared with private syndicates, must in common prudence take the position of not denying to such public bodies the facilities and advantages, when they are legitimate and honourable, which the others have enjoyed and which, if they are denied, cannot fail to place them in a position of disadvantage in regard to others with whom they will have to deal as well as in regard to the great responsibility which they have inherited from those who have gone before them. Without going into the question really on the merits of honorary or salaried service, which after all is a large question, I would ask the Committee to plump for a discretionary power for the Port authority to do what it may think fit and best to advance its interests.

MR. BONAR LAW: On the Second Reading I made very much the same speech as that which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman, and I feel rather strongly on this point. I do not say we should make it impossible for the chairman and vice-chairman to be paid. We should be running a risk. But if we have to pay the chairman and the vice-chairman of this body we admit that to a large extent the new authority is a failure. If you cannot get the best men to do it on the same grounds on which they do it in Glasgow and Liverpool you are getting a different body, and it will be more or less a failure. Just look how it works practically. If the chairman and vice-chairman are to get salaries, one of two things must happen. Either men will seek to get on the Board for the sake of those positions and the salaries which attach to them, or they will look upon these men as their servants, as men who are paid salaries and are in a different position from them, and yet these men with salaries will have a different position. If it is necessary, and I daresay it will be, to get some of these experienced dock people on to the Board, I agree with the hon. Member for Hexham that the way to do it is to pay them big salaries as permanent officials at the head of the Department. The effect will be either to get men who will try to become chairman for the sake of the salary, or it will amount to this, that if you pay big salaries, and you will not get good men without them, to the chairman and vice-chairman, you will pay a smaller salary to the managing director who ought really to do the work. In this case the thing to do from the business point of view is what is done by great industrial corporations, to pay whatever salary is necessary to your managing director and to try to get the direction of this public body on disinterested motives. I am not going to support the Amendment. I admit that the Board of Trade may require to give this authority, but I would like very much if the right hon. Gentleman would say now that he will not agree, in the first body which is under his own sole appointment, to make these appointments until he has made a determined effort to get a good body, including chairman and vice-chairman, without any salaries whatever.

*MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) said he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had rather cursorily rejected this suggestion. The proposal to pay the chairman of a committee was not only quite novel, but he was convinced it was bad essentially. He knew of no authority similar to this which had anything like that power. They had heard that the Liverpool port authority did not pay any of its members. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not set on foot this new proposal, which could only bring about invidious distinctions between members of the same body.

MR. BARNARD hoped the Government would stand absolutely firm to their own proposals. This great business undertaking was nothing like a corporation or municipality. They were asking a new body to take over all the various docks, to put them into shape, and to work the thing as a going concern, the difficulties of which must be profound. The work of taking over a great going concern was much more enormous than any Member of the House could know. The hon. Member opposite, who belonged to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, said he was chairman of a committee and it took two or three hours a week. He (Mr. Barnard) was chairman of the Water Board Committee which managed the whole work when it was taken over for four years, and he was positive it would take an enormous amount of time if they did the work as it was hoped and desired they should do it. In such an undertaking as this they would have to decide whether they were going for a general manager, or whether they intended that it should slide into being managed by officials, and unless they deliberately in the first instance chose first-rate men to be at the head it would drift into the hands of permanent officials. It was very easy to talk about paying £300 a year and that sort of thing, but they did not want retired men who might have been eminent in some other profession and could just spare the time to undertake this work. They could not do the work, and the result would be that they would not do it, although they might be the head-pieces. He was perfectly convinced from his little experience that it was highly desirable for the Government not to swerve in the slightest degree, but deliberately to try and get men of the type they had spoken of, and he did not believe they could do it successfully nor ought they to try to do it unless they remunerated them in a proper manner.

*MR. MORTON hoped the Government would accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Dulwich in regard to the first appointment, to which they had had no answer. There were a number of officials in connection with the docks who might have to be considered. As far as he could understand the matter, they were all to be provided for by getting rid of them, and the directors were not to be retained because they were to have £127,600. London was the cheapest port in the world. Liverpool was anything but that, and Glasgow was a much dearer port, and they had this difference between Liverpool and Glasgow itself. In Liverpool it was all docks. In Gasgow they had no docks at all, and therefore they could not judge much from that what the management would be. He thought if the Government would give them the assurance asked for by the hon. Member for Dulwich, it would help them and give the new authority the opportunity of deciding whether anybody ought to have these big salaries which were suggested.

MR. CROOKS said that unless this Bill was to be recast they must adopt this proposal as it stood on the Paper. If the hon. Member for Dulwich was right and they were going to run it by managing directors, it meant the whole staff were going to run the thing, high salaries must be paid them, and the committee would act as overseer. The hon. Member knew perfectly well that in the commencement of a gigantic scheme such as this they had to get the best possible men. The first vice-chairman and the second deputy-chairman of the London County Council had £1,500 a year for several years for doing the very work they were proposing to do now. When they reorganised the scheme and abolished the office they saved money by giving £2,000 a year to the clerk and £500 a year retiring pension to the man who had been acting clerk before. What they had been getting for £2,100 they got for £2,500. They saved absolutely nothing by it. He did not know whether it was more efficient.

MR. HOLT: I am quite ready to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. MORTON moved to leave out subsection (11) which provided that the first elected members should be appointed by the Board of Trade. In the first place they had no assurance that these persons would represent the trading interests of the Port of London at all. Then the clause went on to say—" the first Chairman shall, if the Board thinks fit, be appointed by the Board and shall, if appointed by the Board, be paid such salary, if any, as the Board may determine." Personally, he thought it would be much better if they waited and elected the eighteen members by the new constituency, so that they should represent the interests that they were supposed to. Then it would be much better to allow the Board to appoint their own chairman. That would get out of the difficulty. They might be political appointments, and have nothing to do with whether the person was a fit and proper person and knew anything about the business whatever. He was afraid that the Board of Trade, if it had the appointments, would be driven to making political appointments. This was such an important Bill that every line in it ought to be considered before they passed it. By spending all the money in purchasing docks they might ruin the Port of London and make it a dear port instead of the cheapest in the world.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 34, to leave out subsection 11."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words of the subsection down to the word 'Board,' in line 35 stand part of the clause."

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Gentleman's proposal ought not, I think, to command acceptance of the Committee. It is physically impossible that the first Port authority should be elected for this reason. The register is a register of payers of dues, and payers of dues cannot be formed into a register until after the schedule of dues and rates has been prescribed, and that schedule of dues and rates has to be brought before the House by Provisional Order and with all the safeguards of Parliamentary discussion. Until that process has taken place, which probably will not be next session, perhaps not the session after that, and until the resulting schedule of rates has been in operation for at least a year, so as to show who are the payers of dues, it would not be possible to form the register. Owing to the way in which the board is to be formed it would not be possible to prepare a register on which the election could be made. If it is suggested that we should try to create a new and revised register merely to get over this gap, I say that would be very inconvenient and troublesome. A great deal of importance is attached by many of the interests concerned to the fact that the first board is to be nominated by the Board of Trade. I must tell the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire that they do not seem to have just such a bad opinion of the Board of Trade as, I am afraid, he has formed in his own mind. The different interests believe that they will get fair and just consideration in the appointments which will be made by the Board of Trade. The discussions have proceeded on that basis, and it is generally understod that our proposals have been made on that basis. The Committee were confronted with the proposal of the hon. Gentleman; it was most carefully considered and rejected, and I have no choice but to urge this Committee to take a similar course and to adhere to the scheme in the Bill, namely, that the first authority shall be appointed by the Board of Trade.

*Mr. MORTON said he never stated that he had a bad opinion of the Board of Trade—certainly not worse than he had of other Departments. He admitted that one difficulty in regard to all of them was to get them to do their duty. Perhaps no greater sinner had existed than the Board of Trade in regard to many things they ought to have looked after. That he could prove, but it would be out of order to go into that matter now. [Cries of "Divide."] No time was gained by making a noise and crying out "Divide." He would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment after what the Government had said. He thought it would be a waste of time to put the Committee to the trouble of dividing. He was sorry that the name of the chairman of the new authority had not been given them by the President of the Board of Trade. The "man in the street" had told them that the chairman was practically named.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:

Mr. LOUGH said he would not move the Amendment of which he had given notice on Clause 2. The object he had in view would be better secured by the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman had put down.

*Mr. MORTON said he understood that Clause 2 was practically the same as Clause 3, and he thought, if it was in order, that the two clauses should be considered together. He wished to ask whether the Government were willing to postpone Clause 3 in order that it might be taken on another day. In that case he would let Clause 2 go through now without moving the Amendments of which he had given notice but it must be understood that they were to have a free hand in discussing Clause 3, which really covered Clauses 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am very anxious indeed that the crucial and fundamental clauses of this Bill, of which Clause 3 is perhaps the most important, should be discussed in the House at the best period for publicity and criticism, and that is also the view of my right hon. friend. It is clear that the crucial issue of the Bill is, of course, the purchase price with which Clause 3 deals. I should be very glad if it were the general wish of the Committee——

*The CHAIRMAN: I think we must have something before the Committee as a matter of form.

*Mr. MORTON: I will move as a matter of form to report progress in order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of continuing his speech.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think it would be for the general convenience of the House if we were, when we reach Clause 3, to postpone it so that it should come on as the first clause to-morrow afternoon. That would enable us to come to a decision on the main principle of the Bill, and I think that is a fair and convenient way of dealing with the House of Commons. This is a Bill of sixty clauses, and so far we have only got to the end of the first clause, and I think that I must ask the Committee—I am very loth to do it—to go on to-night as far as the end of Clause 11. Between Clauses 7 and 11 there have been no Amendments put down. Clause 12 is very important. It deals with the port dues on goods. I think we are agreed generally that we should go down to Clause 11, and we can begin with Clause 3 when we meet to-morrow.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he did not see that the right hon. Gentleman had made any concession by postponing Clause 3. The House had an assurance from the Prime Minister that they would not be kept sitting late to-night. The whole of the debate had been carried on by Members on the

Government side of the House, and he thought it was most unfair to the House after the distinct promise given by the Prime Minister, that they should be asked to go on discussing the Bill. He thought it was going rather far to ask them to continue the debate until Clause 11 had been passed.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said Clause 4 gave power to purchase the undertakings, and he would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should postpone Clauses 3 and 4. An hon. Gentleman below the gangway had given notice of a Motion to leave out Clause 4. Did the right hon. Gentleman propose to start at Clause 4 or 5?

MR. CHURCHILL: Clause 4.

SIR WILLIAM BULL said it would be more convenient to discuss Clause 4 with Clause 3.

MR. LOUGH said there was an essential difference between the two clauses. If the Government proceeded in the way proposed the progress of the Bill would be greatly facilitated. He had no great objection to Clause 4, but he took fundamental objection to Clause 3.

*MR. MORTON said he agreed that Clauses 2, 3, and 4 were really the same, and they should all be postponed. If the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to adopt this suggestion that would suit everybody. He did not think there was any objection to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the other clauses.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to allow the House to be adjourned now.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I really do not think that it is an unreasonable suggestion that has emanated from my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade, and it has been made after consultation with those who are criticising the Bill.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: As regards Clause 3?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, but as regards the other clauses of the Bill. If my right hon. friend will look at the Paper he will see that there is no substantial point of disagreement in the clauses which it is suggested should be taken at this sitting. The concession made by the Government is a very substantial one, and as a means of arranging the debate it is a matter of considerable magnitude, even from the point of view of the consumption of time. The right hon. Gentleman knows the difference between a debate at an early hour of the day and a debate at a late hour of the night; and I think, under these circumstances, that the suggestion which has fallen from my right hon. friend is a very reasonable one. We ought to have down to Clause 12 taken to-night, which latter clause is of considerable importance, and the hon. Member for Dulwich asked that it should be postponed until to-morrow. I trust that the Committee will consent to the arrangement which has been entered into, an arrangement which will enable these important clauses to be taken first at to-morrow's sitting, and debated in broad daylight, when we can take full cognisance of every important point. Two days for this stage is a very reasonable allocation of time, when it is remembered that the influential Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament spent six weeks over the Bill. I trust that in these circumstances my hon. friend will withdraw his Motion.

LORD R. CECIL asked if they sat up to-night to dispose of the clauses down to Clause 11, were they to be asked to sit up to-morrow night to a late hour? If so, he thought that was most unreasonable.

MR. CHURCHILL: I make no assertion as to any particularly arduous late sitting to-morrow night.

LORD R. CECIL said that what the right hon. Gentleman said removed some of the danger. He understood that if they should take down to Clause 11 to-night, the rest of the Bill was to be taken to-morrow. So far as he was concerned, he hoped that the Government would not insist on any such proposal. That would be a very unreasonable suggestion, particularly in view of a new clause to be moved by the right hon. Gentleman reinstating a clause which was rejected by the Committee, and introducing a principle of the utmost possible importance.

Mr. MORTON asked leave to withdraw his Motion that progress be reported.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2:

*Mr. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale) moved to insert "(c) Acquire and carry on the undertaking of the Trinity House transferred to the Port authority by this Act." This Amendment he said involved a point of importance, not only to the Port of London, but to the other ports in the kingdom. There was one function not conferred upon the Port of London Authority by this Bill which was as important as the control of docks or warehouses—the power to light and buoy the port. All other ports in the country managed their own local lights. London was the only port which had its lights and buoys controlled and paid for out of the general funds of Trinity House. How did this anomaly occur? It arose in this way. Trinity House originally had jurisdiction over the Port of London, and it had gradually extended its embrace over the whole of the United Kingdom; but when Trinity House became the lighthouse authority for the United Kingdom, it continued to be the local lighthouse authority for the Port of London.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I rise to a point of order. Is this Amendment in order or not? It is clearly outside the scope of the Bill and Trinity House has had no notice of it.

*Mr. McARTHUR, on the point of order, said the title of the Bill was in very wide terms, and the lighting of the Port of London was part of its administration. He could hardly see how it could be outside the purview of the Bill.

*The CHAIRMAN said that with regard to the point of order he did not think the question of taking over the duties of Trinity House as regarded the Port of London was out of order, although it might involve the Bill being referred to the Standing Orders Committee. But he understood that the duties of Trinity House extended outside the Port of London, and he did not think that taking over and acquiring the undertaking of the Trinity House came within the general scope of this Bill. If so, he must rule it out of order.

*Mr. McARTHUR submitted further that it was only that part of the functions of Trinity House which related to the Port of London which were transferred. What was done by this proposal had been done in other cases. Trinity House had been responsible for the whole of the country, and then gradually the powers had been transferred from Trinity House to the local port authority at Liverpool, Glasgow and other ports.

*The CHAIRMAN: If the proposal of the hon. Member is entirely confined to this port, he is at liberty to move his Amendment.

*Mr. McARTHUR said it was entirely confined to the Port of London, and when the President of the Board of Trade interposed he was endeavouring to explain how it was that London had this almost obsolete system. The reason was that Trinity House originally had this jurisdiction over the Port of London, and the jurisdiction was gradually extended to the whole country. He was going on to say that according to the old system each vessel paid for the lights which it passed, but when in 1898 the new Merchant Shipping Bill was passed, that system was altered and the ships had to pay a certain fixed rate per voyage. The money so collected went into a general lighthouse fund which defrayed the cost of the general lights of the country. The position at present was that London had its local lights paid for for nothing. The money was paid out of the General Lighthouse Fund, whereas Liverpool, Glasgow and the Tyne and Belfast, and other ports supported their own local lights. London, however, was still in a condition of pupilage. It did not control its lights, but they were controlled and paid for by Trinity House. It was all very well as long as London had no Port authority of its own, but now they were going to give London a Port authority why should it not possess this power which they gave to the other ports? The present position was unfair to the other ports. The cost of London local lights was £50,000, and if this amount was paid by the Port of London the result would be that the dues of the other ports would be reduced by 10 per cent. He would conclude by referring to two authorities to support the proposal he made. The first was the Royal Commission on the Port of London which in June, 1902, made this Report—

> "The powers of the Trinity House, so far as they relate to the area of the Port of London as defined by the constituting Act should also be transferred at the same date."

Then there was the Royal Commission appointed on Lighthouse Administration in 1908, who reported as follows—

> "There certainly seems to be an inequality in the present arrangement. It is not, however, an inequality which could be altered by an administrative action of the lighthouse authorities, and since the question, as it affects the General Lighthouse Fund, is of no great practical importance, except as regards the Port of London, and a new Bill for the creation of a Port authority for London is now under consideration, this brief reference to it may, perhaps, be deemed sufficient."

Therefore they had these two recommendations in favour of dealing with the matter, and the second in favour of dealing with it in the present Bill. He wanted to ask whether this anomaly was to be continued—an anomaly for which there was no defence, and one which worked out at the expense of other great ports. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 20, at end, to insert the words '(c) acquire and carry on the undertaking of the Trinity House transferred to the Port authority by this Act.'"—(*Mr. McArthur.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: I hope the Committee will not attribute this proposal to the recommendation of the Royal Commission to which the hon. Gentleman has referred. That recommendation was quite different in its character from the proposal which he has put forward in his Amendment. The Royal Commission recommended the transfer, not only of the lighting and the buoys, but also of the pilotage under Trinity House, and it would be, on the face of it, unwise to transfer the lighting and buoys and leave another authority responsible for the pilotage. In the second place, I submit it is quite clear that this Amendment, if not technically so according to the rules of procedure, is in fact outside the scope of the Bill. Notices were not given to the parties affected and none were given to Trinity House when the matter was before the Committee, and as you, Sir, have indicated, if the Amendment is adopted it will probably lead to the recommittal of the Bill, and the consequent loss of all the fruits of our procedure during the course of this year. It will complicate the labours of the new authority, and those labours are already complicated enough. It is quite true that there is a certain anomaly. I do not deny it, but that anomaly is not created by this Bill, and it existed before this Bill was brought forward, and all we ask the House to do is to put the new authority in as good a position as the old. Let me point to the fact that the effect of the Amendment which the hon. Gentleman has moved would be to relieve to a very inconsiderable extent the General Lighthouse Fund, and would, to a very large extent, burden the finances and complicate the labours of the new authority. The relief to the shipowners all over the country would be practically insignificant. [AN HON. MEMBER: Ten per cent.] I am informed that the saving by this operation to Trinity House would not be more than £3,000 or £4,000 a year. [Cries of "No."] That is what I am informed, whereas to transfer these duties to the new authority would entail the setting up of new machinery, a new office and a new staff, which would cost £16,000 a year. It would incidentally require a special lighting rate which would have to be levied for London, and the new authority, to which we want to give a fair start, would have to being by putting an additional burden on the trade of London, and be put in a worse position than the private companies it will succeed. I hope the Committee will not accept the Amendment.

MR. BONAR LAW said that there seemed to have been some misunderstanding as to what took place in Committee. He undertook that as far as they could say there should be no obstruction when the Bill was before the Committee of the House, but beyond that he said nothing.

MR. E. H. LAMB asked the Chairman's ruling to be made rather clearer because it seemed to him that there was something underlying, something more than appeared on the surface. He submitted to the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool that in his Amendment to acquire and carry on the undertaking of Trinity House transferred to the Port of London there were no words confining it to the Port of London. It was rather serious because they might not have the advantage of the right hon. Gentleman's presence in the Chair when a further Amendment came on apropos of the same point. If before putting the question the Chairman would rule that it was necessary to say in the Amendment that it was confined to the Port of London it would clear the way in regard to a further Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool had down a new clause which he understood was consequential to the Amendment he was now moving, and as he understood that new clause it did intend to confine the action of the Amendment to what was transferred to the Port authority by the Act, and therefore confined the acquirement of what was suggested to be turned over by Trinity House to the Port of London.

MR. E. H. LAMB said he had read the new clause through very carefully to see if there was any safeguard in it to prevent the inclusion of the Medway, and he failed to see it.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said his hon. friend had called the attention of the Committee to the serious pecuniary inequalities caused to other large ports in the kingdom by leaving out of the purview of this new authority the functions of Trinity House as applied to the lighting, and also, he should think, to the pilotage, because in all those other ports those essential features of the port authority were part of the duties of the Port authority, and the effect of leaving them out here was important from a pecuniary point of view. The whole trade of the country had to pay for the special lighting and so on of the Port of London, whereas each other port paid its own special charges relating to those matters. A careful inquiry had been made and it had been ascertained that 10 per cent. of the charges at present levied were ascribable to what otherwise would be charged to the new authority of the Port of London. That was a serious point, because he did not think the Government in bringing forward a Bill of this sort would desire to inflict for all time upon the general commerce of the country a state of inequality or unfairness as between one port and another. There was another very important consideration. When this new Port authority got to work, when it dredged and made its channels and that sort of thing, buoys and lights and similar arrangements continuously had to be altered in order to show the new channels and other arrangements that were continually requiring to be made in conjunction with the navigation of any great port. Their experience in Liverpool, which, after all, was some guide in a matter of this kind, was that in consequence of the alterations in the channels by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and in order to make the port effective, the buoys and the lights and other arrangements were continually requiring to be altered. But what would be the effect if these lights, buoys, and arrangements of that sort were left under one body, Trinity House, whilst the other alterations which they necessitated were to be carried out by another? He could not imagine a more inconvenient arrangement in the interests of trade. It was necessary sometimes at a very few hours notice to alter the position of a buoy or light, and such notice had to be advertised in a certain manner prescribed by the regulations, in order to bring it to the attention of shipping. He thought it was not merely from the point of view of the pecuniary inequality inflicted that this was a serious matter, but from the point of view of efficiency of administration it was extremely desirable that all the functions of Trinity House, so far as they were applicable to the Port of London, should from henceforth be placed under the Port authority, because they were the proper people to carry them out.

*MR. OWEN PHILLIPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said the Members for Liverpool were taking an opportunity in this Bill to make an indirect attack on Trinity House. As a matter of fact the shipowners and shipping trade of the Port of London were quite satisfied that Trinity House could carry out their work in the future as economically as they had done in the past, and it was both misleading and inaccurate to say that if the work of Trinity House was given to the new authority, there would be a saving of anything approaching the amounts mentioned by the Members for the Kirkdale division and the other hon. Members. He trusted that the Government would remain firm, and refuse to transfer this power to the new Port authority, which would have quite enough to do in taking over the docks and managing the great undertaking.

MR. WILLIAMSON called attention to the fact that the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Kirkdale division of Liverpool extended far beyond the Port of London as defined in the Bill. The Amendment referred to an area extending from the estuary of the River Thames westward of imaginary straight lines drawn from the Neptune Tower on the North Foreland in the county of Kent to the eastern extremity of the Sunk Sand, etc. That was an area far beyond the area of the Port of London which was under consideration.

MR. E. H. LAMB said that they were under the disadvantage of not having the new clause before them, but so far as he could see in the Amendment as now before the House there was nothing safeguarding the position—that this undertaking of Trinity House transferred to the Port authority should be confined to the Port of London. Was it not necessary that those words should be inserted?

*THE CHAIRMAN said that if his attention had been called to the fact that the new proposed clause would extend outside the Port of London he should in the beginning have ruled it out of order, but the discussion having been begun, he should not do so at this stage. All the more so because the differences were small. He did not know what the hon. Member for Rochester meant about the Medway. If the Amendment were negatived a new clause could not be proposed at all, and therefore nothing whatever would be done in regard to the Medway. The new clause would be out of order and could not be moved if the Amendment were negatived.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 6; Noes, 125. (Division List No. 374.)

AYES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bull, Sir William James
Cave, George
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—
Mr. M'Arthur and Mr. Fell.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.

Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton,Rt Hn.RichardKnight
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards,Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, SirRobertJ.(Norfolk, E.)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F. (Wolverhampt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waterlow, D. S.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

MR. FELL moved an Amendment to insert after the word "jetties" the word "locks."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 22, after the word 'jetties,' to insert the word 'locks.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'locks' be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL said he would accept the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

MR. CHURCHILL moved that Clause 3 be postponed until after Clause 11 had been considered.

Question, "That Clause 3 be postponed until after the consideration of Clause 11," put, and agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:

MR. BARNARD moved an Amendment to bring expressly within the provision of the clause any liabilities incurred under the Thames Conservancy Act, 1905. He said he could save time if he simply moved the first of his Amendments to this clause. He understood that the Government considered the Amendments were met by the Bill, and upon that statement he would withdraw the whole of the Amendments.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'all property and liabilities of the conservators held, acquired, or incurred in respect of the Thames below the landward limit of the Port of London.'"—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields): I have looked into the points raised in the Amendments, and I find that they are already covered by the words of the clause. The first Amendment is a drafting Amendment. The object of the second Amendment is to bring expressly within the purview of the clause any liabilities in respect of or any sinking fund applicable to the redemption of moneys borrowed under the Thames Conservancy Act, 1905. These are already within the purview of the clause.

MR. BARNARD asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CAVE moved a new paragraph (*g*) repealing so much of Section 160 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, as authorised a toll to be demanded or received in respect of any vessel navigating westward of London Bridge to or from any point eastward of Teddington Lock. He said he was very sorry to move his Amendment at that time, but in a few minutes he could make his case clear. The point of the Amendment was this: by the Act of 1894 special tolls were placed upon vessels navigating westward of London Bridge, but with a proviso exempting vessels not going further west than to Strand-on-the-Green, which was just below Kew Bridge. The Amendment would extend the proviso to vessels going as far as Teddington Lock, and for the reason that the river above Strand-on-the-Green up to Teddington Lock, including Richmond and Twickenham, was placed in the Port of London. He was sorry it was so, but being so he thought they should have the advantage in Richmond of being part of the port for all purposes, and should escape these special taxes now put upon the upper river. The effect of the Bill without this Amendment would be that vessels going westward of London Bridge, say to Richmond, would pay first, of course, the ordinary port due and then the new rate under this Bill; and, thirdly, this special tax, a sort of upper river tax of, he thought, 2¼d. a ton. That was a very great burden upon cargoes going to places like Richmond. It was an old grievance and this was a chance of getting rid of it once for all. The matter was brought before the Joint Committee, and the Chairman said it was an injustice, but that it could be remedied by a Bill to be brought in by the Port authority when formed. It was entirely against his experience, however, that any authority having once obtained power to levy a tax, readily brought in a Bill to take away that power. He was afraid one could not trust to that being done, and he took this opportunity to ask the Committee to remedy the injustice. He thought it was not only hard on that part of the river, but it had this deleterious effect: if they put too high a tax upon river-going cargoes the effect would be and indeed already was to drive the traffic from the river on to the railways. The river lost and the railway gained, and in the end, therefore, the

Port authority lost by the addition of this burdensome tax. He hoped the Committee would support him in freeing this part of the river from the tax.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 42, at end, to insert the words '(g) So much of Section 160 of the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, as authorises a toll to be demanded or received in respect of any vessel navigating westward of London Bridge to or from any point eastward of Teddington Lock shall be repealed.; and.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR H. KEARLEY: This is an old existing grievance I am perfectly aware, and it has been brought to the attention of the Board of Trade frequently of late. It refers to an old due which has been levied now for many years, and the due was re-enacted in the Thames Conservancy Act of 1894. At the time that Bill was before Committee in this House, a very great effort was made on behalf of those who considered this an onerous burden to get it remedied. The Committee of that day felt themselves unable to remedy it, and hence it has endured down to the present time. Now that the powers are being transferred from the Thames Conservancy to the Port authority, the Port authority will inherit these dues, and when I say that the sum involved is £5,000 or £6,000 a year I would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to realise that it is not quite the function of the Government at this time to strip the new Port authority of its revenue. We have had frequent applications made to us from all sections to take this opportunity to do something that in effect would rob the Port authority of its revenue. If we were to begin to strip it of its revenue even in a case of this kind it would make a serious difference to the balance sheet. I will say nothing with regard to what the hon. and learned Gentleman said as to the authority coming to this House to allow them to get rid of this due. All I can say for the moment is that we are not in a position to remit these dues, which would have a serious effect upon the finances of the Bill.

MR. CAVE: I do not think the hon. Gentleman has denied my case at all, but I feel it would not be right for me to divide the Committee on the matter. Having made my protest, however, I reserve the right to raise the point at a later stage. I do not withdraw the Amendment, but I will not divide the Committee.

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD desired to ask a question. As he understood this clause, a considerable fund would disappear from the list of possible investments, namely, the Thames Conservancy Redeemable A. debenture stock. He understood that that was a trustee investment, and he did not find in the Bill from one end to the other anything which made the new stock of the Port authority into a trust security. It was not good finance to extinguish an investment which was a valuable trustee security and to substitute another class of investment which was not a trustee security. If the President of the Board of Trade thought there was anything in this point and would insert a clause somewhere in the

Bill which would make the new Port authority stock a trustee security it would be a great advantage to the fund, because it would enable the money to be borrowed at a slightly lower rate. It would be a great pity in this case to take away from the investment list an available trustee security, and to leave the corresponding fund which would not be available for the purpose of trustees putting money into it unless there was a special clause in the Bill. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would see that this was an important point.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the hon. Gentleman has raised a very interesting point, and I can promise him that I will consider it carefully. I may say, however, I am informed that the A. debenture Conservancy stock is not, in fact, a trustee investment at the present time.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: The debenture stock is.

MR. CHURCHILL: In any event I will consider carefully the financial position—whether it is necessary, and in what way it is possible, to give effect to the point raised by the hon. Gentleman.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7:

MR. MORRELL moved to insert after the word "purpose," the words "or any powers conferred upon them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public with respect to the Thames and its tow-paths." The object of the Amendment, he said, was to give to any local authority who might appear to be interested the same right of appeal with regard to questions affecting public interests as they now had with regard to questions of river pollution, so as to enable any local authority which was dissatisfied as to the exercise of the powers of the Thames Conservancy in the matter of the use of the Thames as a place of public recreation to appeal to the Local Government Board, and if the Local Government Board was dissatisfied to enable that Department to make an order on the Thames Conservancy to carry out the work necessary to remedy the defect. He did not wish to delay the Committee over this Amendment because he understood it was going to be accepted more or less as it stood.

MR. CHURCHILL dissented.

MR. MORRELL said that at any rate there was very little difference between the Amendment that was going to be accepted and this one. He could not quite understand why the Committee should be asked to insert the words which stood in the name of his hon. friend (Mr. Lehmann), because at the end of the clause, as the right hon. Gentleman would see, the Local Government Board might make such order as the circumstances required, and such order should be binding on the Conservancy. It would, therefore, be in the full discretion of the Local Government Board to make such order as they thought fit. The difficulty at the present time was that the powers and duties of the Thames Conservancy were extremely vague. No one knew how far it was the duty of the Thames Conservancy to interfere when obvious encroachments were made on the rights of the public. In one case in his own constituency things had gone so badly that a village built on the banks of the Thames in Oxfordshire, and to which the Thames originally could have been the only possible highway, was now, owing to a series of encroachments, entirely shut out from any approach to the river. The result was that the inhabitants of the village, who were about 900 in number, were unable to get down to the river except by paying a toll. Gradually the road had been shut away from the Thames, and the last encroachment to take place was that a private owner, who had built upon piles sunk in the river, had made a garden between the road and the river, thus preventing people who came up the river in boats from landing. This had happened at Whitchurch. The parish council passed resolutions asking the Thames Conservancy to take action, but the Conservators replied that they were unable to do so as they did not see they had any power to interfere in the matter. Considerable correspondence ensued, but as a result of it all absolutely nothing was done, and to this day that village, which, as he had said, was built on the banks, was entirely shut out from the river. Should his Amendment be carried the Local Government Board would, in a case of that sort, be able to hold an inquiry and make an order. What he wanted to ask his right hon. friend to do was to give the Committee some assurance—in view of Members not pressing a lot of Amendments—that the Government would inquire into the whole question of the powers and duties of the Thames Conservancy with regard to the Upper Thames. At present those powers and duties appeared to be in a very chaotic condition. In 1884, under a Liberal Government, a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the operations of the Act for the preservation of the Thames and the steps that were necessary to secure the river as a place of public recreation. That Committee made an exhaustive inquiry and issued a Report, but from that day to this some of its most important recommendations had never been carried out. At present so unsatisfactory was the position of the Thames Conservancy with regard to the Upper Thames that if a piece of the towing path was washed away the Conservators had no compulsory power to buy land in order to repair it. A great many other instances might be quoted to show how the exercise of the present powers and duties ot the Thames Conservancy was curtailed, but he thought he had said enough to convince the Committee of the necessity of something being done. He had reason to believe that if an inquiry was instituted by the Government into the financial position of the Thames Conservancy it would be welcomed by the present Conservators. They felt that in their present position they could not deal adequately with the very important problems which were continually arising along the many miles of the upper river—matters in which, under existing circumstances, the public suffered the loss of rights and privileges without there appearing to be much chance of securing a remedy. He did not wish further to delay the Committee. If the right hon. Gentleman told them that he was going to deal with the matter then there was nothing more to be said.

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 40, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or any powers conferred upon them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public with respect to the Thames and its towpaths.'"—(*Mr. Morrell.*)

MR. CHURCHILL: I have had the advantage of several discussions with my hon. friend the Member for Oxfordshire upon the general question of the powers of the Thames Conservancy and the carrying out of some of the necessary duties which should be discharged in the public interest on the upper river. I am quite prepared to agree with him that those powers are not all that could be wished, and in many respects no doubt lack of funds has very often prevented the Conservators defending public rights as otherwise they would have wished to do. I can assent on behalf of the Government to adopt, not indeed the Amendment which the hon. Member for Oxfordshire moved, but the Amendment which stands in the name of my hon. friend the Member for Market Harborough. That Amendment, I may point out, is practically the same as that of the hon. Member for Oxfordshire, or at all events it has an exactly similar effect, while at the same time it offers the additional advantage that the words are correct as regards drafting. Therefore I should be prepared to accept the Amendment of my hon. friend the Member for Harborough, the effect of which is to give an appeal to the Local Government Board upon the complaint of the council of any county borough, district, or parish, adjoining the Thames. That is a general assertion of the responsibility of the Conservators towards the rights and interests of the public on the upper river, and taking a step towards enforcing the effective discharge of that responsibility. I certainly agree that an inquiry is desirable into the present power and means for carrying out their duties at the disposal of the Conservators, and that the matter must be considered before the Board of Trade make a provisional order to repeal the Conservancy Act. Therefore while I should not be prepared to enter into any actual binding engagement, I can assure my hon. friend that I am substantially of opinion that the question of inquiry should receive urgent and effective attention from the Government at as early a date as possible.

MR. BARNARD said he was not going to say much against the Amendment because he did not wish to enter into the whole question. He thought it was a very far-fetched thing to allow any rural parish council to lodge a complaint on a subject such as the preservation of the rights and interests of the public. He should like to hear from the Government what this meant, and to what extent it would be carried out.

*MR. MORTON said he would like to say that, having gone into this question on many occasions, he thoroughly agreed that more power was wanted to deal with this subject, but the matter did not lie entirely with the Conservancy. The mischief was done by Parliament when the amalgamation of the upper and lower river took place, and it was agreed that all encroachments in the last twenty years might be kept. That was all the cause of the trouble, for it meant, in other words, that all that had been stolen might be kept. There was no question that more power was needed.

Mr. MORRELL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) moved to add the words "or by the council of any county, borough, district, or parish adjoining the Thames, that the Conservators having failed to exercise any powers conferred on them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public in respect to the Thames and its towing-paths which they ought to have exercised." He was very glad indeed that the Government had agreed to accept the Amendment standing in his name, for he thought that it was necessary that in a Bill of that kind there should be some mention made of the rights and interests of the public. With regard to what the hon. Member for Kidderminster has just said, he thought that the parish adjoining was the one which would suffer most from encroachments, and that, therefore, this power should be given to it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 9, line 40, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'or by the council of any county, borough, district, or parish adjoining the Thames that the Conservators having failed to exercise any powers conferred on them for the purpose of preserving the rights and interests of the public in respect to the Thames and towing-paths which they ought to have exercised.'"

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Morton.

Clauses 8 to 11 agreed to.

Committee report progress; to sit again To-morrow.

APPLICATION OF SINKING FUNDS IN EXERCISE OF BORROWING POWERS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to inquire and report as to the powers conferred on Local Authorities by Local Acts, Provisional Orders, Stock Regulations, or otherwise, of utilising for purposes for which such authorities have borrowing powers, sinking funds (including loans funds and redemption funds) set aside by them for the repayment or redemption of loans raised by the issue of stock or by any other method; as to the expediency or otherwise of such powers being conferred; and as to any conditions which it is desirable to attach to the granting or use of such powers.

Committee accordingly nominated of —Mr. Ashton, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Masterman, and Mr. Charles Nicholson.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum. —(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Whereupon Mr. Deputy-Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute after One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 12th November, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.

Several witnesses ordered to attend the Committee for Privileges on Tuesday next, and produce documents.

BARON KILMAINE.

Petition of John Edward Deane, Baron Kilmaine in the Peerage of Ireland, claiming a right to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland; read, and referred to the Lord Chancellor to consider and report thereupon to the House.

The Marquess of Linlithgow sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1908.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 582. Straits Settlements; Report for 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST (ARGENTINE REPUBLIC)).

The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 26) Warrant, 1908, dated 31st October, 1908: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.], the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.], and the Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.], That the Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.] ought to be allowed to proceed: The said Report (with the Proceedings of the Committee) to be printed. [No. 223.] Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out; Bill reported with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House; and to be printed as amended. [No. 224.]

CHILDREN BILL.

Report of Amendments received.

The **LORD STEWARD** (Earl Beauchamp) moved to amend subsection (1) of Clause 1—

> "(1) Where a person undertakes for reward the nursing and maintenance of one or more infants under the age of seven years apart from their parents, he shall, within forty-eight hours from the reception of any such infant, give notice in writing thereof to the local authority,"

by inserting, after the word "parents," the words "or having no parents." He explained that a point had been raised as to whether orphans could be said to be maintained apart from their parents, and the object of his Amendment was to remove any doubts that might exist.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 9, after the word 'parents,' to insert the words 'or having no parents.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 9 agreed to.

Lord ALVERSTONE moved to add at the end of Clause 14—

> "14. If any person over the age of sixteen years who has the custody, charge, or care of any child under the age of seven years allows that child to be in any room containing an open fire grate not sufficiently protected to guard against the risk of the child being burnt or scalded without taking reasonable precautions against that risk, and by reason thereof the child is killed or suffers serious injury, he shall on summary conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding ten pounds,"

a proviso to the effect that it should be a sufficient defence to a charge under this clause if the defendant proved that a person over seven years of age was left in charge of such child. He had only put down this Amendment in order to indicate what might be a reasonable precaution; but if His Majesty's Government, after consideration, preferred the clause as it stood he would not press his proviso.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 10, line 8, after the word 'pounds,' to insert the words 'Provided that it shall be a sufficient defence to a charge under this section if the defendant proves that a person over seven years of age was left in charge of such child.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the Government were unable to accept the Amendment. In their opinion a child, say, of five left in the charge of a child just over seven would not be very much safeguarded. The Government thought the provision as it stood would sufficiently meet the case.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend subsection (2) of Clause 17—

> "(2) For the purposes of this section a person shall be deemed to have caused or encouraged the seduction or prostitution (as the case may be) of a girl if he has knowingly allowed the girl to consort with, or to enter or continue in the employment of, any prostitute or person of notoriously immoral character,"

by adding, after the word "girl" where it first occurred, the words "who has been seduced or become a prostitute." He explained that the subsection, as amended by Lord Alverstone in Committee, would make a person guilty of having encouraged the seduction of a girl if he had allowed her to consort with a prostitute or other person of notoriously immoral character, whether seduction had resulted therefrom or not. He did not suppose that the Lord Chief Justice intended that this should follow from his Amendment. The words now proposed to be inserted were to make it clear that the girl must have been seduced or become a prostitute before the charge could be made under subsection (1).

Amendment moved—

> "In page 11, line 3, after the word 'girl,' to insert the words 'who has been seduced or become a prostitute.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

LORD ALVERSTONE said that, in his opinion, the subsection absolutely implied this. But if the noble Earl thought the insertion of the proposed words made it clearer he had no objection.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP explained that the object of his next Amendment, which was down in the same terms to various other clauses, was to make it quite clear that the power to revoke or otherwise modify an order of the Court might be exercised by the Court which made the order or by any Court of similar jurisdiction.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 13, line 18, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'that Court or any Court of like jurisdiction.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment to Clause 22 agreed to.

Consequential Amendment to Clause 23 agreed to.

THE EARL OF MEATH moved to add, at the end of subsection (1) of Clause 25—

> "(1) The Secretary of State may cause any institution for the reception of poor children or young persons supported wholly or partly by voluntary contributions, and not liable to be inspected by or under the authority of any Government Department, to be visited and inspected from time to time by persons appointed by him for the purpose,"

the following proviso—

> "Provided that such persons shall be either inspectors or assistant inspectors of reformatory and industrial schools, members of the medical or nursing professions, or persons of discretion and of experience in the management and training of children."

Their Lordships would remember that the original wording of Clause 25, which was altered in Committee, was to the effect that the officials of certain societies engaged in the care and protection of children should be empowered by the Secretary of State to act as inspectors of voluntarily maintained institutions for the care of children. He moved an Amendment to the clause which the Government did not see their way to accept; but they met him, or at least considered they had done so, by altogether omitting the last part of the clause which mentioned these particular societies. He could not see that this concession on the part of the Government had really made any difference, because the Secretary of State would still have the power, if he chose, to appoint officials connected with voluntary societies, however untrained, unskilled, and absolutely ignorant of the proper management and treatment of children they might be. It had been suggested to him that the word "skill" would be better than his word "discretion." He was not at all set on the word "discretion" if the House preferred "skill," but unless some such words as he proposed were inserted there would be a very great temptation to appoint the first official recommended by a particular society for the purpose of inspecting these institutions. The work of inspection was a very delicate matter, but under this clause they were asking one voluntary society to inspect the school or institution of another voluntary society. That was a very dangerous precedent, and he hoped their Lordships would support him in securing the insertion of words providing that the persons who should be appointed for this purpose should be fit and proper persons possessing some knowledge of the management and training of children. He had, in the Committee stage, freely acknowledged the absolute disinterestedness and zeal of these officials. He did not wish to say one word except in praise of them, for he had been himself connected with many of these institutions and knew how public spirited the officials were. But, as he had pointed out in Committee, the more determined and the more interested a man or woman was in carrying out a particular line of conduct the more chance there was that that man or woman was not possessed of a judicial mind. The power to be given to these inspectors was not a nominal one; they could enter the institutions in question at any hour and there was nothing in the Bill to prevent them camping there if they chose. They were to be given a search warrant if there was the least obstruction, and might easily stay the night on the plea that they had not finished their search. He did not desire to prevent inspection, but to secure that the persons appointed were fit and proper persons and had some knowledge of children. Why were the Government so strongly opposed to the acceptance of some such words as he proposed? He could only put it down to one reason—that of economy. He protested against the Government wishing to carry out inspection on the cheap. If the thing was worth doing at all it should be done well, and they ought not to have amateurs sent in.

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 26, after the word 'purpose,' to insert the words 'Provided that such persons shall be either inspectors or assistant inspectors of reformatory and industrial schools, members of the medical or nursing professions, or persons of discretion and of experience in the management and training of children.'"—(*The Earl of Meath.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the noble Earl's Amendment seemed rather to be directed against any inspection at all. But apart from that, he would remind the House that when the noble Earl moved a similar Amendment in Committee, he, on behalf of the Government, offered a compromise which the noble Earl accepted. Yet on the Report stage the noble Earl moved his Amendment again. If all compromises were so treated it would not be very encouraging to the Government to make concessions. The provisions for appointments by the Home Secretary were not unusual in legislation of this kind, and he did not think that their Lordships need have any fear as to the discretion of inspectors so appointed. There was also a good deal to be said with regard to the wording of the Amendment. After all, what constituted the nursing profession? What they wanted was people of discretion rather than people of skill. He hoped the House would agree to maintain the compromise arrived at. As the clause stood, it gave the Home Secretary full authority in the choice of visitors and placed no limitation upon him. If the noble Earl insisted on his Amendment, the Government would have to take a division.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I understand the noble Earl to rely upon some compromise said to have been reached between himself, and, I presume, parties on this side of the House, but we are quite unaware of any such compromise, and we must refuse to be bound by anything which prevents us from considering this clause upon its merits. I think the noble Earl rather misrepresented my noble friend on the cross benches when he told us that my noble friend was altogether opposed to inspection. I did not gather that from his speech. What I gathered from him was that he was very strongly opposed to inspection by persons who might not be qualified for the duty of inspection. Now, what does this clause do? It empowers the Secretary of State to have these institutions visited and inspected from time to time by any persons whom he may choose to appoint for that purpose. It gives an absolutely free hand to the Secretary of State. I fancy we have all of us in our experience of public life become aware of the existence of Secretaries of State holding very extreme views on particular subjects, and what is there to prevent such a Secretary of State appointing for these duties persons holding extreme views on this subject and otherwise not specially qualified? As my noble friend truly said, these *ad hoc* inspectors will have very wide powers and a very delicate task to perform, and I do not think it unreasonable that we should stipulate that the selection of such amateur officials should be to a certain extent fenced in by precautions. I am not prepared to say that my noble friend's words are perfect. It might, for example, be desirable to omit the reference to membership of the nursing profession. But of this I feel pretty sure, that we shall improve the Bill by adding to it some such words as those which my noble friend has proposed. If, therefore, he goes to a division I shall certainly support him.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): The noble Marquess opposite has said that no compromise took place, but, so far as my recollection goes, I certainly understood that a general agreement had been reached on the earlier stage. If I remember rightly, what happened was this. In the Bill, as introduced, there was a stipulation that the Home Secretary might appoint, and by the phrasing of the clause he was almost urged to appoint, officers of certain societies to inspect these various private homes. The noble Earl on the cross benches took exception to that. He maintained that such people were not always discreet, and he proposed something very much on the lines of his present Amendment. In order to meet the views of the noble Earl my noble friend the Lord Steward dropped altogether the allusion to the particular charitable societies whose inspectors were to be used for this purpose, and left full discretion to the Home Secretary. That is how the clause now stands. Nobody took exception to that course at the time, and therefore, I think we have a right to assume that something in the nature of a compromise was reached. Now the noble Earl brings up his Amendment again. We cannot accept his Amendment, because we consider it to be essentially futile. Apart from the point which my noble friend behind me made that there is no such thing as the nursing profession, what is the use of inculcating upon the Home Secretary of the day the duty of appointing persons of discretion? Of course, he will not appoint persons whom he believes to be persons of indiscretion.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: There are the words "and of experience."

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am coming to that. Of course, the Home Secretary will only appoint persons who are, in his opinion, discreet; but if other people think them indiscreet, what is the remedy to be brought to bear on the Home Secretary in relation to a particular appointment? Again, who will be considered persons of experience in the management and training of children? All persons who have children of [illegible] own, I conceive, would believe themselves [illegible] be in that position. Therefore, the only persons who would not be experienced would be the unmarried and the childless. I really think the Amendment is not of a practical character, and I shall certainly support my noble friend in [illegible] dividing the House if that course is necessary.

Lord ALVERSTONE said that when Lord Meath moved his Amendment in Committee the Lord Steward offered to strike out from the clause the words that had been referred to. He (Lord Alverstone) then remarked that if it were found necessary to add a proviso to secure the object desired, it could be brought up on Report. There was certainly no suggestion of a compromise.

*The Earl of HALSBURY said he also took part in the discussion in Committee, and was not conscious of any compromise.

*Earl CROMER urged the noble Earl to omit from the Amendment the words "of discretion and." The proviso would then read "persons of experience in the management and training of children."

Lord HENEAGE hoped the noble Earl would also omit the reference to the nursing profession.

The Earl of MEATH said he was in the hands of the House, and would be quite willing to agree to his proviso being amended in the way suggested.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'or nursing professions,' and to insert the word 'profession.'"—(*Lord Heneage.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved to the Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'of discretion and.'"—(*Earl Cromer.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, That the Amendment as amended be added to the clause.

Their Lordships divided:—Contents 60; Not-contents, 39.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Marlborough, D.
Newcastle, D.
Rutland, D.
Somerset, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Linlithgow, M.
Normanby, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cromer, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Halsbury, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Morley, E.
Waldegrave, E.

Wharncliffe, E.

Falkland, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)

Bangor, L. Bp.
Salisbury, L. Bp.

Alverstone, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Atkinson, L.
Balfour, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Borthwick, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*) [*Teller.*]
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Colchester, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
Heneage, L. [*Teller.*]
Hindlip, L.

Kenry, L. [*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kenyon, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kinnaird, L.
Knaresborough, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leith of Fyvie, L.
Llangattock, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Poltimore, L.
Rosmead, L.
Sanderson, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Stanmore, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Tennyson, L.
Waleran, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Wolverhampton, V. (*L. President.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. Privy Seal.*)
Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carlisle, E.
Carrington, E.
Chichester, E.

Craven, E.
Granville, E.
Lytton, E.
Russell, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)

Airedale, L.
Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.

Blyth, L.
Boston, L.
Burghclere, L.
Colebrooke, L. [*Teller.*]
Coleridge, L.
Eversley, L.
Farrer, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]

Haversham, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Lochee, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
MacDonnell, L.
O'Hagan, L.
St. Davids, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Swaythling, L.
Weardale, L.

*LORD **BELHAVEN AND STENTON**, in the absence of Viscount Hill, moved to amend the proviso to Clause 40 (Forfeiture of Tobacco)—

> "Provided that such constable or park-keeper shall not be authorised to search any girl so found smoking."

so that it would read—

> "And such constable or park-keeper shall be authorised to search any boy so found smoking, but not a girl."

Amendment moved—

> "In page 23, line 32, to leave out the words 'Provided that,' and to insert the word 'and'; and in the same line to leave out the word 'not,' and in line 33, to leave out the word 'girl,' and to insert the word 'boy,' and after the word 'smoking' to insert the words 'but not a girl.'"—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton.*)

EARL **BEAUCHAMP** accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clauses 42 and 43 agreed to.

EARL **BEAUCHAMP** moved to amend subsection (1) of Clause 57—

> "(1) Where a youthful offender, who in the opinion of the Court before which he is charged is twelve years of age or upwards but less than sixteen years of age, is convicted, whether on indictment or by a Court of summary jurisdiction, of an offence punishable in the case of an adult with penal servitude or imprisonment, the Court may, in addition to or in lieu of sentencing him according to law to any other punishment, order that he be sent to a certified reformatory school,"

by omitting the words "Court of Summary Jurisdiction" and inserting the words "Petty Sessional Court." The difference between the two Courts was that a Court of Summary Jurisdiction in certain cases acted with a single magistrate, whereas a Petty Sessional Court acted with two. It was thought desirable that in these cases there should be two justices present.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 29, line 6, to leave out the words 'Court of Summary Jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD **ALVERSTONE** moved to amend subsection (*f*) of Clause 58—

> "(*f*) Frequents the company of any reputed thief, or of any common or reputed prostitute other than the mother of the child; or,"

by deleting the words "other than the mother of the child." As the subsection stood, a mother known to be a common or reputed prostitute could not be deprived of the custody of her child. He understood that the Home Office were of opinion that the child would be sufficiently protected under the other subsections of the clause, but he was satisfied that His Majesty's Government did not know the terrible suffering and injury to little children that occurred through their being in the company of this class of woman, even though she were the child's mother. The horrors were unspeakable. He knew of cases of little children between the ages of five and seven who had been ruined for life physically by what their mothers had allowed to be done to them; and he thought it was terrible that under this Bill, which was going to do so much for children, it should be impossible to deprive a notorious prostitute of the custody of her child. On the last occasion the subject was before the House the Government defended the subsection on the plea that the company of the child had a refining influence on the mother. This was a Bill, not to reclaim the mothers, but to save the children; and he knew from his experience as a Judge that for one case in which the child reclaimed the mother there were ninety-nine cases in which the children were ruined, morally and physically, by abandoned mothers. He therefore moved to omit the words "other than the mother of the child." If the subsection were thus amended, it would still be left optional with the magistrates not to take the child away if they thought its company would have a reclaiming influence on the mother.

Amendment moved—

"In page 30, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words 'other than the mother of the child.'"—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the clause generally gave power to the magistrates to take a child from a mother who by reason of "drunken or criminal habits," or for any other reason, was unfit, in the opinion of the Court, to have charge of the child. The Government were unable to accept the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord; but they were willing to strengthen the provision in subsection (*d*) by the insertion of the words "or of being a common or reputed prostitute."

THE EARL OF HALSBURY said that the words suggested by the noble Earl would not have the desired effect if subsection (*f*) was left unamended.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It is perfectly clear that if the words go out in subsection (*f*) the offer of my noble friend behind me (Earl Beauchamp) falls to the ground. The view that the Government have taken is that there are undoubtedly cases of the kind mentioned by the noble and learned Lord opposite, where horrors of an almost indescribable kind may occur to young children from the fact of their being in the company of a prostitute, that prostitute even being their mother. But, on the other hand, it is a very hard thing to say, which the Bill would practically say otherwise, that the mere fact of a woman leading an immoral life is a sufficient reason for depriving her of her child.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: "May" deprive.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: True; but I think that is the implication which would be conveyed in the Bill, and that is a length to which I think your Lordships would be unwilling to go. There may be a great many mothers who, unfortunately, lead immoral lives but yet are fond of their children and, so far as they can be, are good to their children; and if it is understood that the mere fact of frequenting the company of any common or reputed prostitute is a reason for the child's being taken away I think it will be found that a great many magistrates will assume that they are directed by the Bill to take a child away from an immoral mother in every case. That is a course which His Majesty's Government would deeply regret.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I cannot help thinking that the words which have been offered to my noble and learned friend the Lord Chief Justice in subsection (*d*), which are very good words as far as they go, will be of no avail if subsection (*f*) remains unaltered. If we amend subsection (*d*)—

"Is under the care of a parent or guardian who, by reason of criminal or drunken habits is unfit to have the care of the child,"—

but leave (*f*) as it stands this is what will happen. A child will be found in the care of a mother who is a common or reputed prostitute, and thereupon the Bill will apply; but if other words remain in the Bill further down especially exempting the case where the prostitute happens to be the mother of the child the effect of the earlier words will be entirely neutralised.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) said there was no difference of opinion between their Lordships as to the object aimed at. The point was really how best to do it. He thought the two paragraphs in the clause would naturally stand together. If the mother were unfit to have the custody of her child, it could be taken away. There would, however, be another opportunity of considering the point if that view turned out to be erroneous. For himself, he could not help thinking that their purpose would be served by the acceptance of Earl Beauchamp's suggestion.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY was sorry to disagree with his noble and learned friend on the Woolsack. A magistrate might come to the conclusion that, by reason of her conduct, and so on, the mother was unfit to have charge of the child, but he would find later on in the clause that the case of the mother was especially exempted. The magistrate would, therefore, construe the clause as preventing him from finding that the mother was unfit because the mother was especially exempted by subsection (*f*).

LORD ALVERSTONE expressed his willingness to consider any Amendment on the point which the Government might put down for the Third Reading stage, but said he really could not withdraw his Amendment.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said that in view of Lord Alverstone's decision, he should not move his own Amendment.

THE LORD BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD desired, with all his heart, to support the plea so bravely put forward by the Lord Chief Justice, and said he could, from his experience as a parish priest in the slums of our large towns and also from the testimony of many clergymen, corroborate what the noble and learned Lord had said as to the evils arising from allowing a mother of this class to retain custody of her child.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend subsection (2)—

> "(2) Where a child apparently under the age of twelve years is charged before a Court with an offence punishable in the case of an adult by penal servitude or a less punishment, the Court, if satisfied on inquiry that it is expedient so to deal with the child, may order him to be sent to a certified industrial school,"

by inserting, after the word "Court," the words "of Assize or Quarter Sessions or a Petty Sessional Court." The object was to do away with the power of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction when it was not sitting as a Petty Sessional Court to order a child charged with an offence to be sent to an industrial school.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 30, line 22, after the word 'Court,' to insert the words 'of Assize or Quarter Sessions or a Petty Sessional Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment to Clause 58 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend Clause 60, which was inserted in Committee on the Motion of Lord Lytton, viz.—

> "Where under the provisions of this part of this Act an order is made for the committal of a child or young person to the care of a relative or other fit person named by the Court, in any case where such child or young person has been charged with an offence before the Court making the order, such child or young person may be placed under the supervision of a probation officer in like manner as if he had been charged with an offence and dealt with under the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907,"

by leaving out all the words after "named by the Court" in order to insert other words. The object of the Amendment was to extend the operation of the clause, not only to those cases where an offence had been committed, but also to the case where a child or young person though not an offender was brought before the Court as coming within the many categories mentioned in Clause 58, subsection (1), which would enable the Court to send him to an industrial school.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 32, line 30, to leave out from the word 'Court' to the end of the clause, and to insert the words 'the Court in addition to such order make an order under the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907, that the child or young person be placed under the supervision of a probation officer. Provided that the recognisance into which the child, if not charged with an offence, or the young person is required to enter, shall bind him to appear and submit to the further order of the Court.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments to Clauses 66 and 67 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to add at the end of Subsection (2) of Clause 68, which ran—

> "Every child sent to an industrial school, shall, from the expiration of the period of his detention, remain up to the age of eighteen under the supervision of the managers of the school,"

words which he explained were left out in Committee owing to an Amendment by Lord Kinnaird being taken by mistake as accepted by the Government. He hoped there would be no objection to the restoration of the proviso, the object of which was to secure that a child sent to an industrial school for purely educational purposes should not be liable to supervision after attaining the age when education ceased to be compulsory. Without that provision, they would be practically treating as a criminal a child who had not been guilty of any serious offence.

Amendment moved—

"In page 36, line 41, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'Provided that this subsection shall not apply in any case where the child was ordered to be sent to an industrial school for the purpose only of enforcing an attendance order made in consequence of his parent, guardian, or other person legally liable, to maintain him neglecting to provide efficient elementary instruction for him.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

*LORD KINNAIRD said he regretted that the Government proposed to re-introduce this clause. The class of children sent to industrial schools under the subsection was found to be identical in character with the other children in the schools. It was undesirable to make a distinction with regard to supervision amongst the different children in the same school. The supervision was of a benevolent and parental nature, and for the benefit of the children, and there seemed to be no reason why these children should be deprived of this benefit. The after-care of children who had been sent to industrial schools was a most important part of their training and protection. After they left the schools the Home Office rightly required that the managers of the schools should keep in touch with them for three years, and report as to their conduct. Recognising the difficulty which the managers experienced in befriending and protecting these children, Parliament, in 1894, passed the Industrial Schools Act Amendment Act, under which most of them were placed under friendly supervision for two years after leaving the school. But the Act provided that if the children had been sent to the schools under the Elementary Education Acts, 1870 to 1893, they should not be under supervision on leaving. Nevertheless, the Home Office still required reports upon them. The result had been that often in the same school there were some children who would not be under legal supervision on leaving, and some who would, and yet identically the same class of children, perhaps even brothers and sisters. The managers held that if their supervision was for the good of the children, and that was generally admitted, and if they were to be required to report to the Home Office annually concerning the children, and it was right that they should, then they ought to have the same powers of control if they saw one of the old boys or old girls going to the bad. They ought not to have their hands tied by this exception, which had for so many years hindered them in their good work. The law had been found to work well as far as they had been allowed to exercise it, and there was no justification for this exemption clause, for there was the best possible evidence that the children so exempted were the same class and needed supervision as much as the other children. He hoped, therefore, that the House would not agree to the re-introduction of the words which had been omitted.

LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH questioned whether the Government were not making a mistake in trying in any way to create the impression that the supervision which took place with regard to a child after it had left the industrial school was in the nature of police supervision. This was what would be done by making the proposed distinction. The supervision which the managers gave to children after they had left industrial schools was eminently to the interest of the children, and he was sorry to see the supervision branded in this way.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to amend Clause 70, which provided that—

"If any youthful offender or child detained in or placed out on licence from a certified school, or a person when under the supervision of the managers of such a school, conducts himself well, the managers of the school may, with his own consent, apprentice him to, or dispose of him in, any trade, calling, or service, or by emigration, notwithstanding that his period of detention or supervision has not expired; and such apprenticing or disposition shall be as valid as if the managers were his parents."

He asked their Lordships to insert after the words "calling or service," the words "including service in the Navy or Army." He said that although the words "calling or service" were sufficient in themselves to cover service in the Navy or Army, it was thought well that the managers should have this specially brought to their notice.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 38, line 28, after the word 'service,' to insert the words 'including service in the Navy or Army.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 72 agreed to.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY moved the omission of subsection (2) of Clause 74. The subsection ran—

> "Where a child is ordered to be sent to a certified industrial school it shall be the duty of the local education authority of the district in which he resides (to be specified in the order) to provide for his reception and maintenance in a certified industrial school suitable to the case, having regard to the requirements of this Part of this Act."

He said this point was raised in Committee by the noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore, and the more he considered it the more serious and important he regarded it, and he felt bound to press with all the energy he could the impolicy of the proposal in the clause as it stood. The principle with which he was dealing applied to reformatories and industrial schools, but reformatories were in a different position, and therefore he would limit his remarks to industrial schools. His object was to restore the Bill to its original shape as introduced by His Majesty's Government in the House of Commons. The change of which he complained was made in the Grand Committee, and it was vital to the interests of local education authorities. When a Bill was sent to Grand Committee it was entirely withdrawn from public observation; the proceedings were not reported, and the persons concerned did not know what was going on. The result in this case had been that in the Grand Committee a most serious change had been introduced which placed a very heavy financial burden on local authorities, while at the same time it fettered their judgment and power of action. Originally the subsidising of voluntary industrial schools was left to the discretion of local authorities. They could subsidise or not; they could impose conditions and terms, and they were not responsible for the whole cost. Now, by this Bill the local authorities were not given a discretion to subsidise these schools within certain limits, but had the duty placed upon them of providing for the reception and maintenance of the children sent to them. That which was formerly a right was thereby converted into a duty. He thought it would be agreed that the words "provide for his reception and maintenance" threw the whole burden of maintenance upon the local authority. It might be said that subsection (8) of this clause still kept alive the power of making bargains; but what was the use of that power when the duty of bearing the whole cost had been thrown upon the local authority? Children were brought forward to be sent to industrial schools, not at all solely or mainly on the initiative of the local education authority. The Report of the London County Council for the year 1906–7 showed that there were charged by the police, 756 children; by officers of the London County Council, 523; by private individuals, 322 children; and by parents, 134 children. Their Lordships would, therefore, see that the large majority of the cases were not initiated by the bodies who, under this Bill, would have to pay. Moreover, the magistrate had absolute power to name the school to which the child should be sent, provided that school was willing to take him. This removed altogether the discretion of the local authority in the matter of the school. He understood that there was no need for any agreement between the local authority and the managers of the school, because when the school took the child they made a demand upon the local authority whose duty it became to pay. The local authority became chargeable with the whole financial burden, but had not one word to say as to the measure of local expenditure. It would be quite within the power of the managers of a school to raise the salaries of their staff and otherwise to increase the cost, and then to send in the bill to the local authority.

The great mass of improvements in industrial schools during the last twenty-five years had been the result of the pressure which great public authorities had brought to bear by coupling the requirements for greater efficiency with more liberal grants. The Home Office had shown no initiative in regard to these improvements, but had followed in the steps of the local authorities. Before Mr. Legge became the inspector, the Home Office were perfectly satisfied if the standard of education in industrial schools went up to the Fifth Standard, and were quite content with the most inefficient and stupid modes of industrial employment, such as wood-chopping, which did not in any way fit the child to earn his living in the future. Many of the industrial schools used to carry out strictly their name by putting the children to work half-time when other persons would have been summoned for so doing. All this had been improved as a result of the action of the local authorities, who had insisted upon a more enlightened curriculum, and upon the children not beginning industrial training until they had received the first elements of education. Again, it was often found that there was neglect in the proper selection of persons to whom the children should be licensed, and over this and other important matters connected with the future of the children a rigorous supervision had been exercised. The stimulus in bringing about the desired reform was liberal grants. In London, the grants had been increased at three separate periods, and now the London County Council had introduced a scale of grants which might go up to 10s. per child. In Committee, the Government had given a very good character to the Home Office; they were told that the Home Office were prepared to look in a broad and liberal way at the question of finance, but the latest evidence showed that the Home Office and the Treasury between them were prepared to do nothing of the kind. An Inter-departmental Committee, appointed in 1905, reported in favour of a considerable number of increases of grants from the Treasury; the great mass of those were rejected, and only a few small additions allowed. He had no hesitation in saying that if the Treasury could throw upon the local authority the statutory obligation of bearing the whole cost in this case, they would have a very active disposition still further to restrict their grants. The fact that a school possessed the Home Office certificate was not in the least an assurance that it was a fit school to which to send children. It took a long time before the Home Office actually withdrew its certificate. Local authorities might have knowledge of schools where the discipline was harsh, the life inert, the teaching dull, the methods superannuated; yet they might be compelled to send children to those schools. He was not now, or at any time, opposed to the maintenance of voluntary industrial schools; on the contrary, he recognised that there were certain qualities of voluntary management which a public authority would make a great mistake not to take advantage of. He found in the recent Blue-book, like a fly in amber, an extract from a speech he made a little while ago at an industrial school anniversary at Macclesfield on the proper attitude of the State towards industrial schools. Therefore he did not stand before them as one hostile to voluntary industrial schools. But what would be the effect of this Bill? They were putting the burden of payment on one set of people, and the power of spending on another. A more profligate policy of waste he could not imagine, and it was all the more extraordinary as coming from a Liberal Government who had been occupied for some years in denouncing the shortcomings of Mr. Balfour's Act in relation to the voluntary schools. By that Act voluntary schools were undoubtedly put on the rates, but the local authority had complete financial control. He was not saying that the powers of control were sufficient. But here the safeguards for financial control embodied in Mr. Balfour's Act were utterly disregarded. He would utilise these observations as a warning to the Government that they should at any rate be consistent with themselves, and not denounce in connection with an elementary school what they proposed to do to a very much worse extent in connection with industrial schools. Industrial schools were very often more intensely denominational than ordinary schools; and if they were allowed to increase the salaries at their own discretion this would be, in many cases, equivalent to an endowment of the convent or order at the expense of the ratepayers. He earnestly hoped their Lordships would not strike this blow at local self-government by imposing upon persons who had not been consulted an obligation which hitherto no one had ever contemplated could reasonably be placed upon them. Voluntary industrial schools as compared to those under public management were about five to one, except truants schools and day industrial schools. It might be said that if a public authority did not choose to pay for the children in these voluntary industrial schools the public authority might build schools of its own. He would be very sorry to see that; he would regret to see voluntary schools not utilised to the utmost when they could be, by judicious co-operation between the public authorities and the school managers. Moreover, did they think it likely that the Home Office would sanction the establishment of new schools when the existence could be shown of four or five thousand available places in schools under private management? If the clause passed in its present form the voluntary managers would be able to spend what they pleased and compel the counties to pay what they demanded.

Amendment moved—

"In page 41, lines 13 to 18, to leave out subsection (2)."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the Government were obliged to adhere to their decision on a similar Amendment moved in Committee. He ventured to think that Lord Stanley had taken a somewhat exaggerated view of what was likely to be the effect of the subsection. A large number of local authorities already took advantage of the power which they possessed, and the chief alteration made by the subsection was that it compelled the other authorities to make arrangements and to provide for the reception and maintenance of children ordered to be sent to certified industrial schools. The practical result of the subsection would probably be that the local education authority would make such conditions with the managers of the school to which a child was sent as they thought right. They could, and probably would provide for their representation on the board of management and for the price at which the child should be taken. The subsection was not nearly so violent as the noble Lord seemed to think. The local education authority would also be entitled to be heard before the magistrate as to the choice of a school. That the obligation imposed by the subsection should be put on the local education authority was strongly urged on the Government on the Second Reading and afterwards, and it was inserted in Committee on those representations. The provision had met with approval in many quarters and he hoped their Lordships would allow it to remain.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE pointed out that the old practice was that the magistrate made the order for the child to be sent to a school and that the local authority had the right to select the school; but under this provision the magistrate would actually select the school. It seemed to him a very considerable and far-reaching change to say to the authority, "You must provide the money, but you shall not have the right to veto the school. You shall only have the right to try to do so."

On Question, Amendment negatived.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved an Amendment with the object of securing the representation of the local authority on the governing body of the school. The change which this Bill made consisted in taking away from the local authority the absolute right of selecting the school and substituting for that merely the right to protest before the magistrate against the school selected. Their Lordships had decided not to alter that, and therefore that would be the position in the future. But he felt that if that was to be the case, and if the local authority were not to have a controlling voice in the selection of the school, they should at any rate be assured of representation on the board of management of the school. The noble Earl the Lord Steward had said that the local authority would be able to arrange for this in making the contract. He wished he thought so. If a school chose to stand out and decline to allow representation, the local authority would, nevertheless, if the magistrate accepted that school, have to pay though they might be absolutely ignorant of the conditions under which the school was conducted. As Lord Stanley had shown, practically all the improvements that had been made in industrial schools had been due to the pressure of local authorities; but under this Bill that power of pressure disappeared. Local authorities were placed in a much weaker position in making their bargain. The Liberal Party had provided an exact precedent for his Amendment in the Elementary Education Act of 1893 dealing with blind and deaf children. Clause 3 of that Act provided that—

> "The terms of contribution approved by the Education Department may include provision for the representation of the contributing school authority on the governing body of the school to which it contributes in cases where such representation appears to the Education Department practicable and expedient.'

This was an exact parallel, and as it came from the forefathers of the present Government he hoped his Amendment on the same lines would be accepted.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 42, line 42, after the word 'provision,' to insert the words 'and in cases where it appears to the Secretary of State practicable and expedient the contract shall provide for the representation of the local authority on the governing body of the certified school.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the Home Office were not of opinion that this was a necessary Amendment, and therefore, he could not accept it. The local authority could make out the conditions of the contract which they would come to, and the position of the local education authority and of the managers of the school was the reverse of that which the noble Earl seemed to imagine. Instead of the local education authority going cap in hand to the managers, he thought it far more likely that the managers of the schools would be anxious to have the children, and to have them at a reasonable price. In return for that undoubted advantage there was no doubt at all that they would be perfectly willing that the local authority should be represented upon the governing body. In the opinion of the Government it was better that this matter should be left to mutual arrangement between the local authority and the representatives of the school.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said the noble Earl the Lord Steward had completely misread the Bill if he supposed that the power of contracting was of any use at all. It was not the local contributing authority who selected the school. What determined the admission of the child was the wish of the magistrate, the consent of the parent, and the willingness of the school to receive. The power of contracting was a very useful one when it was a voluntary act, but it was useless here because the two parties were not negotiating on equal terms. The local authority could not come to an arrangement as to how much they would contribute, for the Bill provided that the local authority should pay the whole cost.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My own knowledge, I confess, is imperfect, but I am anxious to understand what the point made by the noble Earl opposite and the noble Lord behind me actually is. I understand that their argument is that the magistrate consigns the child to a particular school, and it then becomes imperative on the local authority to send the child to that particular school whereby the power of bargaining on the local authority's side disappears.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Is valueless.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The local authority, as I understand, will send the child to a school at which it has paid, or is prepared to pay, for a place for him or her; but if the local authority does not pay for that place it is in no way bound to send the child to that particular school. That being so, I should have thought that a very considerable bargaining power remained to the local authority. There is nothing in the Bill, either explicit or implicit, as it seems to me, which really gives the power which is ascribed by the noble Earl opposite to an order to send a child to a particular school.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said there was not so much between the Government and himself as appeared. The opinion of the Government seemed to be that the dangers he apprehended could not occur under the Bill. Having secured that admission he was satisfied, and would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Consequential Amendment to Clause 75 agreed to.

Drafting Amendments to Clause 108 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved the insertion, in Clause 108, of a new subsection enabling the Local Government Board to transfer from the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the London County Council any buildings for the purpose of remand homes under Section 4 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, the buildings to become places of detention for the purposes of Part V. This was, he had understood, an agreed Amendment. But he had that day received a communication from Lord Middleton concerning it, and if it were necessary to make any further change it could be done on Third Reading.

Amendment moved—

"In page 62, line 25, after the word 'county,' to insert the following new subsection: (12) The Local Government Board may by order transfer from the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the London County Council any buildings provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board for the purpose of remand homes under Section 4 of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, together with any liabilities incurred by the Metropolitan Asylums Board in connection with such buildings, and on such transfer the buildings shall become places of detention for the purposes of this Part of this Act, and the order may also provide for the transfer of any officers employed by the Metropolitan Asylums Board in connection with such remand homes, and for securing to such officers any rights as to pension or otherwise to which they may be entitled.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Crewe.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved the addition of a new subsection to Clause 111. Its object was, he said, to secure that where a mistake had been made with regard to the age of a child the proceedings should not be delayed but should proceed irrespective of the mistake.

Amendment moved—

In Clause 111, page 63, line 36, after the first "and" to insert the words "a Court of Summary Jurisdiction so sitting in this Act referred to as a juvenile Court.

"(2) Where in the course of any proceedings in a juvenile Court it appears to the court that the person charged or to whom the proceedings relate is sixteen years or upwards, or where in the course of any proceedings in any Court of Summary Jurisdiction other than a juvenile Court it appears that the person charged or to whom the proceedings relate is under the age of sixteen years, nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing the Court if it thinks it undesirable to adjourn the case from proceeding with the hearing and determination of the case.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved to insert, at the beginning of Part VI., the following new clause—

"Where a woman is convicted of the murder of her infant, and that child was under the age of one year, the Court may, in lieu of passing a sentence of death, sentence her to penal servitude for life or any less punishment."

Their Lordships would remember that he moved the insertion of this new clause in Committee, but postponed it until this stage on the suggestion of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. He did not wish to enlarge upon it. The considerations for and against this new clause lay within a small compass. In point of fact the death penalty in such cases had become obsolete, and since 1849, though sentence of death had often been passed, it had never been carried into effect, with the result that it was repellant and revolting to those who knew that the sentence would not be carried out, and it was horrifying to those who, being ignorant, thought the sentence meant what it declared. If it could be included among beneficial or harmless conventionalities it might remain, but he found himself in unison with the Home Secretary in the opinion that it was neither beneficial nor harmless, and interfered with the due administration of justice. Where there was no choice between conviction and acquittal juries were very much disposed to acquit a mother of the murder charge. In Scotland, where juries had the alternative of conviction for culpable homicide, there had in twenty years been no conviction for murder in such cases, and in England juries took refuge in verdicts of concealment of birth. That showed the feelings of the juries in those painful cases. Moreover, a good many people would not give evidence at these trials. The consequence was that the administration of justice was obstructed. When they overtaxed any commodity they produced smuggling. In like manner, when they over-punished people they defeated their purpose of bringing the guilty to justice. One of the arguments which had been advanced against his Amendment was that it set up two standards of the sanctity of human life. But all that his Amendment proposed was to enable the Judge not to announce a punishment which, by common consent, ought not to be inflicted. It had also been said that it was not fair to put Judges in the position of having to decide whether the sentence should be one of death or penal servitude. He should have thought it would be an alleviation of the painful position the Judges were now in of being obliged to pass sentence of death if the jury convicted. His Amendment gave the Judges the right, if they thought fit, to extend mercy in the sentence, as the Home Office extended it in the actual punishment; and he submitted that the Amendment was quite appropriate to a Children's Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"After Clause 113, and at the beginning of Part VI., to insert the following new clause: 'Where a woman is convicted of the murder of her infant, and that child was under the age of one year, the Court may, in lieu of passing a sentence of death, sentence her to penal servitude for life or any less punishment.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD ALVERSTONE said that when he spoke on the last occasion he had only had two hours to consider his noble and learned friend's Amendment. Since the Committee stage he had given this matter his most careful consideration, and he was sorry to say he felt obliged to ask their Lordships not to accept the Amendment. He would be glad to consider a scheme for the reform of the law, whereby this difficulty—the painful character of which he fully recognised—of having to pronounce the death sentence in cases where it would not be carried into effect might be removed, but it was impossible to do it by an Amendment to the Children Bill. He could understand the application of some such a clause to the case of a poor girl who in the frenzy of delivery killed her infant; but he feared that if the clause, as it stood, were adopted, the worst murders of infants—the killing of infants of three or six months old by deliberate starvation and ill-treatment—would become of much greater frequency. If his noble and learned friend thought that by this clause he would get rid of the sentence of death in cases where the Home Office did not allow it to be carried out, he was greatly mistaken. There were, of course, numbers of cases besides those of infanticide where the same difficulty arose. He could not imagine anything worse than to leave to the discretion of the Judge the question whether or not the death sentence should be imposed, particularly in the case of the murder of every infant up to the age of one year. It should depend upon the law, and not upon the view of the particular Judge. If the Amendment were adopted there would be what would be known as hanging Judges and non-hanging Judges; there would be Judges who would think it right to pass sentence of death and others who would not. The Lord Chancellor had pointed out one way in which their object might be achieved, by allowing a verdict of culpable homicide to be returned. If that were right, let them assimilate the law of England to that of Scotland in this matter. Personally he had always felt that it was wiser to have the difficulty dealt with by the prerogative of mercy exercised through the responsible Minister.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR asked that he might be allowed to say a few words by the indulgence of the House. He was glad his noble and learned friend thought that some remedy was necessary, but none had been suggested, and the only remedy was that which was recommended to their Lordships, after the most careful consideration, by the Home Secretary and himself. If the House thought a year was too long, he was willing to modify the clause by inserting some shorter time, say three months. He recognised that the necessity of passing sentence of death would still exist in other cases where it was obvious from the circumstances that the sentence would not be executed. These were cases which could not be classified, but that difficulty did not arise in regard to the cases referred to in his clause. He could assure the House, not on his own authority, but on the authority of those more qualified to judge, that the present system seriously interfered with the administration of justice.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY confessed that it was with considerable reluctance that he differed from his noble and learned friend upon the Woolsack. He was quite aware how earnestly and carefully the Lord Chancellor had considered this matter, and regretted his inability to concur in his view. His noble and learned friend had stated that the law as it stood did mischief. He was not quite certain that his noble and learned friend had not very much exaggerated that mischief. He felt that the adoption of the Amendment would do infinitely more mischief. It was quite true that for a very long period it had not been usual to inflict the death penalty in such cases as they had in mind; but was it desirable to make a general proclamation that the death penalty would never be inflicted for these murders? The fact that the death penalty might be inflicted was intended as a deterrent, and he thought it would be a very questionable proceeding to make it the law that the death penalty could never be inflicted. He thought that the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice and of the other Judges—for in this matter the Lord Chief Justice represented the feeling of the other Judges—who had actual experience in the administration of the criminal law, was of overwhelming importance in a point of this kind. Their Lordships would be taking a very great responsibility upon themselves if they ran counter to the opinions of the Judges who were daily engaged in such matters. He was a little surprised that no reference had been made to the fact that within his memory it was not compulsory upon the Judge to inflict the death penalty; he might record judgment of death, but need not inflict the sentence. He remembered well the discussions that took place on that matter. One of the important arguments against it, and which carried with it the Legislature, was that the discretion of exercising the sentence to put to death ought not to be committed t the Judges, and partly for the reason stated by the Lord Chief Justice. He had the utmost respect for the Judges, most of whom were personal friends of his own, but they had peculiarities, and should not have the power of determining whether or not the death sentence should be passed. When it was the practice for the Judge to have discretion either to pronounce sentence of death or simply to record it, the arguments against that were so cogent that, he believed without any opposition, the law was repealed. With regard to the Amendment now before the House, if the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice and the Judges had been the other way, he would have felt bound to yield his opinion to theirs, but, inasmuch as he had come to the conclusion that the Lord Chief Justice was right, he should vote with Lord Alverstone and against the Amendment if they went to a division.

THE LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK pointed out that the question before the House was not one of extending or contracting the area of the death penalty, but whether it was desirable that a sentence of the most solemn kind should be publicly pronounced when not only would it not be carried out, but when every one present in Court, except, perhaps, the poor prisoner, knew it would not be carried out. Personally, he must leave the question to those more skilled in legal matters, but if the Lord Chief Justice did not join with the Lord Chancellor in this attempt to remedy an admitted defect in our procedure, he hoped Lord

Alverstone would feel in his conscience that some responsibility rested upon him to take action in some other way.

Lord ASHBOURNE said this was a Bill to safeguard the lives of children and to benefit children. The Amendment, though meant in the best possible spirit, was not calculated to enhance the security of the lives of children. The Amendment taken by itself might have the effect of weakening respect for the lives of very young children. In the first few months of the lives of children, before they could do anything to help themselves, it was a very grave step to do anything which might take away that solemnity and sanctity which should be attached to life. The Amendment would thrust upon the Judges a most painful duty and responsibility. The evil of these death sentences being passed had, he thought, been exaggerated, for over and over again, in cases of infanticide, juries, instead of bringing in a verdict of guilty of murder, brought in merely a verdict of concealment of birth. While perfectly ready to examine a well-conceived and well-considered measure of reform, he was unable to support the new clause on the ground that he did not think it should find a place in a Bill dealing with the protection and welfare of children.

*The Earl of CREWE: The discussion of this Amendment has been almost entirely confined to legal members of the House of the very highest authority. I do not propose to add anything to what has been said by my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack, who, I think, has stated his case as clearly, as fully, and as temperately as it can be stated. I merely rose to ask a question on a point of fact. I understood Lord Halsbury to quote the Lord Chief Justice as having said that he was stating not merely his own opinion but that of the Judges as a whole. I did not hear that fall from the Lord Chief Justice.

Lord ALVERSTONE said that he had consulted all the Judges at present in London, and they entirely agreed with the view he had expressed on this subject. He believed, however, that Lord Coleridge entertained a great objection to the sentence of death being passed and not carried into effect, though he did not know that the noble and learned Lord was in favour of the option being given to the Judge.

Lord COLERIDGE said that a sentence which was never carried into effect ought not to be passed, and the reasons in favour of not passing in public a sentence which was never carried into effect were surely stronger when that sentence carried with it the great ceremonial solemnities of passing sentence of death. Whoever had passed through the experience of passing such a sentence knew well that he had discharged a very grave function indeed, and to deprive that function of its solemnity was to deprive it of its reality as well as of its efficacy as a warning. Though he could not vote against the Amendment, he recognised that there were very grave objections to the placing in the power of the Judge the decision whether or not he should pronounce the sentence of death. The sentences in the case of women dealt with by this clause were never carried into effect, and he did not think that in these particular cases the Judge should feel bound to take upon himself a personal responsibility not given by the law which he must discharge according to the verdict of the jury. Though he recognised the gravity of the reasons urged by the Lord Chief Justice, he thought that in this particular class of offences the danger indicated would never arise; and therefore, on the whole, he would vote for the Amendment of the Lord Chancellor.

On Question, "That the new clause be there inserted."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 36; Not-contents, 42.

CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Crewe, E. (*L. Privy Seal.*)
Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carrington, E.
Chichester, E.
Craven, E.
Granville, E.
Lytton, E.
Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Allendale, L.
Armitstead, L.
Colebrooke, L.

Coleridge, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Farrer, L.
Glantawe, *L.*
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Hemphill, L.
Herschell, L.
Lochee, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
Marchamley, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Pirrie, L.
Poltimore, L.
St. Davids, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Shuttleworth, L.
Stanmore, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Weardale, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Newcastle, D.
Somerset, D.

Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Camperdown, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Halsbury, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Morley, E.
Plymouth, E.
Russell, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]

Falkland, V.
Goschen, V.
Hood, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
St. Aldwyn, V.

Alverstone, L.
Ardilaun, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Cheylesmore, L.
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Colchester, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
Heneage, L.
Hindlip, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kinnaird, L.
Knaresborough, L.
Lawrence, L. [*Teller.*]
Leith of Fyvie, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Sanderson, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

EARL RUSSELL moved the omission of Clause 118. This clause, he said, dealt with the children of vagrants, and provided that such children who were of school age might, in certain circumstances, be taken from the vagrants and sent to an industrial school. There were, of course, vagrants of various kinds, and his attention had been particularly directed to the case of gypsies, which differed from that of other vagrants. Subsection (1) of the clause enacted that—

> "If a person habitually wanders from place to place and takes with him any child above the age of five, he shall, unless he proves that the child is totally exempted from school attendance or that the child is not by being so taken with him prevented from receiving efficient elementary education, be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding with costs twenty shillings, and shall for the purposes of the provisions of this Act relating to the descriptions of children who may be sent to a certified industrial school, be deemed to be not to be exercising proper guardianship over the child."

That subsection threw upon the vagrant parent the onus of showing that the child was receiving sufficient elementary education, and it applied to children as young as five years. Subsection (2) provided an exceedingly summary and rather drastic way of enforcing this provision. It ran—

> "Any constable who finds a person wandering from place to place and taking a child with him may, if he has reasonable ground for believing that the person is guilty of an offence under this section——

that was to say, that his child was not receiving efficient elementary education—

> "Apprehend him without a warrant, and may take the child to a place of safety in accordance with the provisions of Part II. of this Act, and that Part shall apply accordingly as if an offence under this section were an offence under that Part."

That subsection actually gave power to a village constable to enter a caravan of gypsies and immediately arrest, without warrant, a parent, if he thought his child was not receiving efficient elementary education, and also take the child away. He was informed by those who were acquainted with the affection which gypsies had for their children. and their resentment of interference, that any attempt to enforce this subsection would provoke a great deal of disorder, and possibly lead to riot or bloodshed. He had been informed that gypsies had shown themselves willing to take advantage of education for their children if, for instance, arrangements could be made by which the children could be educated chiefly in the winter months, when the gypsies were not travelling about. It had been suggested that there was no great hardship in the provision, because the gypsy or other vagrant could find some relative with a fixed abode who would take the children. That was a very easy and convenient departmental view, but the probability was that the pure-blooded gypsy had no settled relatives, and, in case he had, he would have to pay a substantial sum for the keep of the children; so that he lost the society of his children, and had to pay what, to him, would be a considerable sum for their support. He did not propose to press for the omission of the clause at this stage, but hoped the Home Office would consider the matter, and see whether it would not be possible to deal with the problem of the education of such vagrant children by methods of conciliation rather than by force.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 118."—(*Earl Russell.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the Government were unable to accept the Amendment. The real point was that the machinery of the Education Acts broke down when it was a question of trying to get these children into school, because by the time the ordinary procedure was followed, the gypsies had moved to a place outside the jurisdiction of the authority. Therefore, it was essential that the constable should have power to deal with the matter summarily. His Majesty's Government attached a good deal of importance to the clause. Their hope was that the children in question might be boarded with relatives during the winter months, and, if so, one of the chief objects of the clause would be attained.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE asked the noble Earl in charge of the Bill to consult with the Home Office as to whether the very great power given in subsection (2) might not be restricted to a more responsible person than a constable. He suggested the substitution of an inspector of police or a sergeant.

LORD FARRER hoped the Government would retain the clause as at present drafted. He did not think anyone not living in semi-rural districts round large towns knew the extent of the evil. These vagrant children were simply brought up to a life of crime. He had been told by the police in his own district that certainly 50 per cent. of the crime there was accounted for by vagrant families. They were not the gypsies of the old kind, with whom he had a certain amount of sympathy; there were extremely few of the old gypsies felt. He failed to see why the children of vagrants alone among English children should escape the Education Act. It seemed to him that the arguments of the noble Earl who moved the Amendment were directed rather against the Education Act of 1870 than against this particular clause. Canal-boat children were under similar difficulties, but their education had been provided for in very much the same way under the Canal Boats Act. It would be quite impossible to deal effectively with these children without some such drastic clause as that under discussion. The law at present was being evaded, and it was the unanimous wish of the county councils that the clause in the Bill should remain.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think this is a question of some difficulty, because we all, even the noble Lord who has just sat down, have a certain sympathy with the genuine gypsies who carry into this very unromantic age some flavour of a more attractive life than that which is led by many people in this country. But, on the other hand, there is an admitted evil, and none of us go so far as to say that because a man chooses to live in a van rather than a house and prefers to wander about the roads he should therefore be excused from the liability of having his children educated. My noble friend the Lord Steward will, I am sure, consider this point very carefully before the next stage, and see whether any means can be found of meeting the objections raised by the noble Earl with reference to the somewhat drastic proposal in the clause, though I do not think it will be very easy to do so for the reasons mentioned by the noble Lord who spoke last. It is very difficult to devise any half-way house between immediate action by the constable and round-about action which is altogether ineffective. But my noble friend will consider the matter with the Home Office, in the hope of arriving at some solution.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY was glad to hear the sympathetic way in which the noble Earl the Leader of the House had treated this difficult matter. They all had some sympathy with the gypsies, who were happy in their own way, and were intensely attached to their children; and it struck him that to give power to a perhaps too zealous policeman to take a child of these people away, perhaps a little child of five, because, in his opinion, its education was not being properly attended to, might be inflicting considerably more hardship than their Lordships would really desire. The difficulty had been freely stated by the noble Earl who had just sat down. There was no reason why these children should remain uneducated. He hoped that, if the clause were passed into law in its present form, it would be tenderly administered, though he did not feel that the village constable was the person he would trust to administer tenderly a provision of this sort.

LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH said this was a matter which had greatly interested the county councils, and in the early part of the session he introduced a Bill dealing with it. He had not, however, proceeded with the Bill, because one of the chief points in his Bill, the education of these wandering children, was being dealt with in this particular measure. While he admitted that his proposals were in a way less drastic than those in the present Bill, still he was sure the Government had framed this provision after much consideration and that they were warranted in their action by the necessities of the case. While vagrant parents were allowed to wander about it was impossible for any attendance officer to carry out the law. It was necessary to stop their peregrination, and the provision in the clause seemed to him suitable for the purpose. He did not think there was any probability that the power would be hardly used, or that the vagrant would be arrested unless he proceeded to wander after being warned that he was required to bring his child before a magistrate and answer for the offence he had committed. He hoped the clause would stand, even if it were necessary to modify it in some particular.

EARL RUSSELL withdrew his Amendment, in view of the satisfactory assurance from the noble Earl the Leader of the House that the matter would be considered.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to omit the words "or nurse" from Clause 119, which ran—

> "If any person gives, or causes to be given, to any child under the age of five any intoxicating liquor, except upon the order of a fully-qualified medical practitioner or nurse, or in any case of sickness, or apprehended sickness, or other urgent cause, he shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding three pounds."

It was proposed to omit these words on the ground that they were unduly vague. If they inserted before the word "nurse" the words "fully qualified," the objection was that there was no body of recognised qualified nurses in this country. On the other hand, if the word "nurse" were not qualified there was nothing to prevent any one who might call himself or herself a nurse giving intoxicating liquor to the child. In these circumstances, it was thought better to omit the two words altogether. There would still be adequate safeguard in the clause.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 66, line 13, to leave out the words 'or nurse.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I think the noble Earl is quite right in omitting from this clause the reference to nurses. I almost wish he would have a little more courage and omit the clause altogether. It seems to me one of the most extraordinarily foolish provisions that could be put into the Bill. It is a clause which renders liable to pains and penalties any person who gives any intoxicating liquor to a child under the age of five except in case of sickness or apprehended sickness. Does the noble Earl think that any conviction is likely to be possible when either of these excuses can be pleaded by the person who gives the intoxicating liquor? The excuse will be that the child was not feeling very well or that it was expected that the child was not going to be very well. It seems to me that this is a specimen of the kind of vexatious and superfluous legislation of which I am afraid a great many examples are to be found in this Bill.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It is quite possible that the number of convictions under this clause may not be very great, but it is an unfortunate fact that a very large number of children are brought up on stimulants. They are also brought up on other classes of food which are just as bad for them. A large number of children are given a share of whatever is going at the family meal, including stimulants. I think if this is made an illegal practice it will call the attention of such parents, who act out of thoughtlessness rather than out of desire to do mischief, to the fact that it is extremely reprehensible and dangerous. Therefore the clause does seem to me to serve a useful purpose.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Making our statutes into sermons.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment in Clause 131 agreed to.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH explained that his Amendment to Clause 131 was designed to secure that in Scotland the officers of local authorities should have the same power as the officers of similar local authorities in England and Ireland to institute proceedings for a certain class of offences. He did not see why there should not be this power in Scotland. Probably the noble Earl the Lord Steward would reply that the whole system was different in Scotland, that they had in that country a system of public prosecutors who were paid by salary, and that if this power were given to the local authority a claim would immediately afterwards be made for the payment of the fines to the local authority, which would cut into the Treasury's right to take the fines. He did not propose, at that late hour, to raise a discussion on the point; but he would be very glad to have an assurance that those who controlled the procurators fiscal would see that in this matter the law was administered with promptitude and efficiency.

Amendment moved—

"In page 73, line 27, after the word 'magistrate' to insert the words 'Provided further that a prosecution for an offence under Part I. or Part II. of this Act may be instituted by the inspector of poor or any other person authorised by the local authority.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP said he was authorised by the Lord Advocate to assure the noble Lord that the procurators fiscal would be specially instructed in the matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Verbal Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to leave out subsection (21) of Clause 131.

Amendment moved—

"In page 75, line 34, to page 76, line 15, to leave out subsection (21)."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH asked whether the precise effect of this Amendment would be to leave the law exactly as it stood at the present time in Scotland. The subsection would undoubtedly have seriously altered the law of settlement, and would have made the particular parish in which the child sentenced to the industrial school happened to be at the moment of arrest liable for all time to defray the expenses. He desired to make sure that the acceptance of the noble Earl's Amendment would not only leave the law of settlement in these cases in the same position as it was, but place local authorities in Scotland in exactly the same position in relation to the Treasury as local authorities in England. If so, he would not move the later Amendment which stood in his name on the Paper.

LORD HERSCHELL said he was authorised to assure the noble Lord that local authorities in Scotland were in precisely the same position, in the connection which he mentioned, as the local authorities in England and Ireland; and also that the Bill made no change in the law of settlement in Scotland.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved the insertion of a new subsection, which he explained had been adjusted in consultation with those interested in the matter.

Amendment moved—

"In page 79, line 5, after the word 'order,' to insert the following new subsection: '(26) The immediately preceding subsection shall apply to the Aberdeen Reformatories and Industrial Schools Act, 1885, as if it were herein re-enacted with the omission of the portions thereof under the headings (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*), and with the substitution of the last-mentioned Act for the Glasgow Acts.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^a on Tuesday the 24th instant, and to be printed as amended. [No. 225.]

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 12*th November*, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP M).

Sir LUKE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group M. of Private Bills: That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, 17th November, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petitions for legislation, from Berkhampsted; and New Barnet; to lie upon the Table.

IMPORTATION OF PLUMAGE PROHIBITION BILL.

Petition from Nottingham, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Three Petitions from Swansea, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Marple, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 30th September, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 26) Warrant, 1908. Dated 31st October, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Overtime in the Dundee Post Office.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the postal and telegraph staffs at Dundee have been working overtime almost continuously during the present year, and that an assurance was given last year that overtime would be considerably reduced during 1908; and whether he will inquire into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I regret to find that a considerable amount of overtime has been required of the postal and telegraph staff at Dundee during the present year. This has been chiefly attributable to the demand for officers to act as season and leave substitutes at other towns. I am glad to inform the hon. Member that proposals have now been framed with the view of obviating the necessity for so much overtime at Dundee.

Wages of Transferred Postmen.

MR. DU CROS (Hastings): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, during 1907, a number of postmen applied for transfers to various towns; that those transfers were granted, and forms were signed by the men accepting them upon the rates of wages shown therein; that many of these transfers were held over for departmental or other reasons until January and February of this year; that on the transfers being made the men were given rule-books setting out the wages of the offices to which they were transferred; and whether, in these circumstances, he will issue instructions that the circulars of February and July, reducing wages at various offices, shall not apply to those men who obtained sanction for their transfers under the higher rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have been considering the case of the postmen referred to by the hon. Member and I have arranged for all postmen transferred before 14th February, 1908, to have the choice of old or new scales at the office to which they have been transferred.

Admiralty Purchase of Greenock Foreshore.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland with reference to the property of ten acres of land and four and three-quarter acres of foreshore near Greenock, which was recently purchased by the Admiralty for torpedo purposes for £27,225, and which at the time of that purchase formed part of a property of forty-eight acres of land (with foreshore not entered on the valuation roll) which was entered on the valuation roll as of the annual value of £75, if he can now say by how much that £75 valuation for rating of the larger property has been reduced by reason of the severance of the purchased portion.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) By £11 2s.

Ventnor Telegraph Clerks' Grievance.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that at the Ventnor office the instructions in the recently issued circular dealing with minor irregularities have been disregarded, and that the local secretary of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association has been punished for drawing attention to the circular in question; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if any, what, action in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The officer in question has been guilty of repeated acts of negligence and has been punished for them in the ordinary course. The punishment had no connection either with the recent circular referred to (which has not been disregarded) or with the officer's membership of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association.

Irish Postal Baskets.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the amount expended in the purchase of baskets for the Irish department of the Post Office and parcels post; whether he can state how much of this sum is expended in the purchase of baskets manufactured in Ireland; and whether any repairs are executed in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) With the exception of two wicker tops for handcarts, the whole order for baskets for the Irish parcel post service will go to Irish firms. I am sorry to say the requirements this year are very small, and the cost will be under £11. I have also given to an Irish firm an order of about the same amount for baskets for use in England. Repairs are executed by Irish firms; they were paid £110 10s. 4d. on that account in 1907–8. The Board of Public Works inform me that baskets used for indoor work in the Dublin sorting office and other post offices in Ireland are obtained in Ireland at an annual cost of about £27.

Ballyshannon Postal Service.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received recently further communications from Ballyshannon, in which complaint is made of the delay in the postal service and the great inconvenience and dislocation of business resulting therefrom, the letters of the first morning post not being delivered on some occasions during the last week till nearly mid-day; and whether he intends to take immediate steps to remedy this alleged grievance, which is one of long standing and the subject for years of repeated representations to the postal authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). An application for the improvement of the service to Ballyshannon reached me a few days ago, and I am having inquiry made.

Port of London.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can give the particulars as at the end of the year 1907 set out in the two tables printed on page 28 of the Report of the Royal Commission on the Port of London.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping, who supplied the figures to the Royal Commission, have been good enough to furnish me with similar particulars published by them on 1st July, 1908. These figures are based on gross tonnage and not on net tonnage, as in the case of the statistics published by the Board of Trade. The particulars are as follows:

Number of Steamers afloat of all nationalities (excluding warships) of 2,000 tons gross and over, according to Lloyd's Register Book, published on 1st July, 1908—

Tonnage.	No.
2,000 to 2,999 - - - -	2,359
3,000 to 3,999 - - - -	2,012
4,000 to 4,999 - - - -	1,173
5,000 and above - - - -	1,199

Number of Steamers afloat (excluding warships) belonging to the following countries, according to Lloyd's Register Book, published on 1st July, 1908:—

Nationality.	5,000 tons to 6,999 tons.	7,000 tons to 9,999 tons.	10,000 tons and above.
British - - - - -	373	159	64
American (United States) -	140 (*a*)	30 (*b*)	10
Dutch - - - - -	24	—	6
French - - - - -	65	9	3
German - - - - -	124	39	30
Russian - - - - -	9	3	—

NOTE.—(*a*) Including 100 trading on the Great Lakes of North America.
(*b*) Including 19 trading on the Great Lakes of North America.

Irish University Commissioners.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will furnish a list of the payments, if any, to be made to the Dublin and Belfast Commissioners respectively, appointed by Section 6 of the Irish Universities Act, or, if no sums have been fixed, the rate or scale according to which they are to be paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) No remuneration is payable to the Commissioners, but they will receive payment for expenses incurred by them according to the usual scale for members of Royal Commissions.

County Cavan Evicted Tenants.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the townlands, owners, and area gazetted in County Cavan for compulsory acquisition under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907; what was the date of gazetting; and when is it expected that these lands will be available for the evicted tenants.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The accompanying statement gives particulars of the lands in County Cavan which have been gazetted for compulsory acquirement under the Evicted Tenants Act—

(1) Date of publication of Notice in Gazette.	(2) Owner.	(3) Townland.	(4) Area.		
			A.	R.	P.
(1) 12th May, 1908 -	Charlotte Hinds - -	Dreamland	32	0	0
(2) 29th May, 1908 -	” ” - -	Linn	97	1	32
(3) 12th May, 1908 -	J. S. Winter and another	Cornaglare or Palmira	337	2	27
(4) 12th May, 1908 -	Samuel Saunderson -	Dreenan	88	0	20
		Clarebane	9	2	22
(5) 14th August, 1908 -	John Fay - - -	Coolkill Leehary Mullacastle Tonylion Leiter Ballytrust Ballytrust Lower Drumakinner Corncarrow Lisgannon Ratrussan	366	2	3
(6) 30th October, 1908	Eugene M'Manus - -	Pottle	88	1	5

In Nos. (1) and (2) appeals have been lodged by the owner under Section 2 (ii.); in (3) and (4), as the result of objections lodged under Section 2 (1), the proceedings have been discontinued; in No. (5), an inspector has been directed to inspect and report on the property in compliance with Section 2 (3); and in No. (6) the time prescribed pursuant to Section 2 (1) for lodgment of objections has not yet expired. Having regard to the proceedings pending, the Commissioners cannot state when the lands may be available for evicted tenants.

Cancer in Ireland.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if there has been a continually increasing number of deaths from cancer in Ireland since calf lymph was used for vaccination.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As I have already stated, nothing, so far as the Local Government Board is aware, has been advanced to show that there is any connection between calf lymph vaccination and cancer. Calf lymph has only been in general use in Ireland since 1900, and the cancer death rate had been increasing for many years previously.

Notification of Infectious Diseases.

MR. LUPTON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the statement of Dr. Alexander James, F.R.C.P., Edinburgh, that compulsory notification and isolation of infectious ailments has acted injuriously; if his attention has been called to the statement of Dr. C. K. Millard, medical officer of health for Leicester, to the effect that hospital isolation has failed to reduce scarlet fever; and will he introduce legislation to make notification and removal to a hospital non-compulsory in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My hon. friend has called my attention to the statements in question, but I understand that the great majority of the medical profession take the opposite view. I cannot undertake to introduce legislation for the purpose suggested.

Runcorn Vaccination Death.

MR. LUPTON: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if the Local Government Board has now made an inquiry into the case of the nine weeks old female child of Mr. Edward Johnson, of 14, Albert Street, Runcorn, vaccinated on 29th September, inquest held on 16th October, death from septic poisoning; and if he will in consequence discontinue the dissemination of poisonous matter to be put into the blood of healthy children.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have obtained a copy of the depositions taken at the inquest in this case. The child died from septic poisoning following on septic abscesses on the eyelids and behind one ear. It appears that the mother was suffering from an abscess of the breast, and the medical evidence at the inquest renders it practically certain that the abscesses in the child were the result of accidental inoculation of poison from the mother's abscess, and were not in any way caused by vaccination.

Babies and Tuberculosis Germs.

MR. LUPTON: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has any figures to show that every year 10,000 babies are killed, 10,000 impregnated with the germs of tuberculosis, 10,000 impregnated with the germs of cancer, and 50,000 debilitated, as regards their teeth and eyes, by the illness caused by impregnating infants of tender years with poisonous matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) No, Sir, I have no such figures; and, so far as I am aware, there are no such facts.

Admiralty Timber Contracts.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty apply direct to German firms for tenders for timber; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of restricting such applications to British firms for the future.

(*Answered by Dr. Macnamara.*) Tenders for Dantzic fir are invited both from selected firms of German exporters and from British agents. This competitive method has advantages as compared with dealing exclusively with British firms.

Small Holdings in Kent.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many applications under the Small Holdings Act, 1907, have been applied for in the county of Kent; the amount of land asked for; the amount of land which has been obtained; the number of persons whose applications have been supplied; and in what parts of the county is the land situated.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The information for which my hon. friend asks is as follows: Number of applications received, 714 (53 of which have not yet been dealt with); acreage applied for, 9,648 (including 591 acres asked for by the 53 applicants referred to above); amount of land acquired, 495 acres 3 roods 12 poles; number of persons whose applications have been supplied, 31 by the council, 12 applicants have been supplied with 114 acres direct by private landowners; situation of land acquired, 34¾ acres at Capel, 69½ acres at Hawkhurst, 10¾ acres at Marden, 27½ acres at Shorne, 7 acres at Bilsington, 128¾ acres at Bredhurst, 133¾ acres at Appledore, 30¾ acres at Sandwich, 28¾ acres at Nettlestead.

Edenbridge Labourer's Grievance.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can state the name of the late employer of David Nicholls, the Edenbridge labourer, to whose case his attention has been called, and what were the reasons assigned for the instant dismissal of Nicholls on Saturday last, immediately ensuing upon his eviction from his cottage by Mr. Churches, also the name of the owner of the land upon which Nicholls was recently employed, and the name of the landlord part of whose land Nicholls applied for as a small holding; and what steps he proposes to take.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that David Nicholls, the Edenbridge labourer to whose case his attention has been previouly directed, is desirous of being reinstated in Prettyman's Farm, Four Elms, from whence he was recently evicted and which is now vacant, and to acquire some adjoining land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907; and whether he proposes to take any steps to secure that the cottage and land shall be negotiated for with a view to providing Nicholls with a home and means of livelihood.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to reply to these two Questions at the same time. One of our inspectors has made a full inquiry into this case. Mr. Churches let part of the farmhouse on Prettyman's Farm, Edenbridge, which he rents from Colonel Streatfield, to Mr. Nicholls in November, 1906, at 5s. a week, the other part remaining empty. Early this year Mr. Churches received an offer of £30 a year for the whole house, and he thereupon told Mr. Nicholls he would have to leave. This occurred before he knew that Mr. Nicholls was applying for the house and part of the farm under the Small Holdings Act. Mr. Nicholls raised no objection at the time. Mr. Nicholls is not one of Mr. Churches' farm labourers, and, except for odd jobbs, he has not been employed on the land for the last three years. For the last five or six weeks he has been working as a bricklayer's labourer for Mr Joseph Winter, builder, of Four Elms, who told him last week that the work for which he was engaged would be completed in a few days, and that he should therefore look out for another job. The Board understand that Mr. Nicholls personally has no grievance against either Mr. Churches or Mr. Winter and that they have no animosity whatever against him.

Black Scab in Potatoes.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board are aware that the black scab of the potato has broken out in Germany; and whether they intend to take steps to prevent the importation of diseased potatoes into Great Britain by issuing an order in similar terms to the Irish Order of 1st October, which prohibits the importation of diseased potatoes into Ireland.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board understand that the disease in question has appeared in certain small holdings in Germany that are cropped year after year with potatoes, but that fields under rotation are free. The Board do not propose to adopt, at any rate at present, the suggestion of the hon. Member.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board will proceed against the outbreaks of black scab in potatoes in England and Scotland by adopting the same measures as are being carried out in Ireland, namely, the immediate destruction of the diseased tubers and the isolation of the infected area; and, if not, why this disease should be treated differently in this country.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The number of outbreaks of the disease in Great Britain is far greater than is believed to be the case in Ireland. In all case growers have been urged to destroy diseased tubers and to take other means for preventing the spread of the disease, but it would be impracticable to "isolate" all the diseased premises. Isolation to be effective would have to be enforced for more than five years.

Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that the Gooseberry Mildew Orders have been in force for more than a year, the Board will now present Returns showing the areas infected in each county, the number of outbreaks and the success or failure of the measures adopted by order of the Board to deal with the disease; and whether the Board will in future secure that the fungicides used in connection with their Orders should be approved as efficient by the Board, as is done in connection with sheep dips under the Sheep Scab Orders.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) A report on the administration and effect of the American Gooseberry Mildew Order Orders will be issued in due course. There seems no good reason for the adoption of the suggestion contained in the latter part of the Question, as the fungicide usually used is that specified in the Board's Orders, and in the rare cases in which other fungicides have been used the Board have been consulted as to their efficiency.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board were advised, as long ago as 1st October, that an outbreak of gooseberry mildew had occurred in the county of Surrey; whether any order has been issued by the Board to deal with the disease in the county of Surrey; and whether, in view of the fact that during October and November most of the necessary sales of plants takes place he will say what precautions have been taken at this time to prevent the spread of so infectious a disease.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. An inspector visited the affected premises and explained the procedure and precautions to be adopted in dealing with the disease. The Board have no evidence to show that the disease is spreading in Surrey, and have not therefore considered it expedient to issue a special order for that county at present.

Crockham Hill Dairy Farm.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that the Crockham Hill dairy farm has been advertised for sale at £50 an acre, though the owners now ask the Kent County Council £60 an acre for the land, and that the adjoining land has been recently sold at £14 an acre; whether he is aware that the agent for the county council also acts for the owners of Crockham Hill dairy farm, and has advised the latter to raise the price; and whether he will state what further action it is proposed to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The facts are substantially as stated. As I have already said, in answer to a previous Question, the county council are negotiating for the acquisition of the farm, and the Board have advised them to acquire it compulsorily if they are unable to do so by agreement on reasonable terms.

Edinburgh Coopers' Conviction.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the conviction of two coopers in Edinburgh who were engaged in peaceful picketing in a dispute with sundry brewing firms, such men being charged under the Edinburgh Municipal Police Act, 1879, while under the Trade Dispute Acts, 1871 to 1906, they could do what they were convicted for doing; and does he propose to take any action to get such a conviction quashed.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) I may be allowed to answer this Question. These men were not charged with any offence under the Edinburgh Municipal Act, but with the common law offences of breach of the peace and assault in the one case and breach of the peace with threats of violence in the other. They seem in every respect to have had a full and fair trial, and had legal assistance in their defence. I have no power to get the conviction quashed.

Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has now received sufficient information to enable him to hold out some prospect that aged persons of excellent character who, prior to the passing of the Old-Age Pensions Act, had been compelled to accept relief will be entitled to share the benefits of the Act with their more fortunate companions.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I understand that the point is engaging my right hon. friend's careful attention, but that he is not yet in a position to make any definite announcement upon it.

Married Couples and Pensions.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if an income accruing to one person of a married couple is calculated as to half its amount to each of such persons, or as the sole property of the person to whom it accrues.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The means of a person, being one of a married couple living together in the same house, are calculated in precisely the same way as the means of a person who is not married, viz., at the amount received or enjoyed by him or her individually, except that, under the proviso contained in Section 4 (2) of the Act, the means of such a person cannot be taken as being less than half the joint means of the couple.

Aliens and Pensions.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the number of applications for pensions received from aliens who have become naturalised in this country and have resided here for the qualifying number of years.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My right hon. friend is unable to furnish the information desired by the hon. Member.

Highlanders and Pensions.

MR. FELL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if applications for pensions have been received from more than half of the inhabitants in certain of the villages in the Highlands of Scotland; and if there is any certain means of ascertaining the age of these applicants.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) My right hon. friend has no means of knowing what proportion of the inhabitants of the villages in the Highlands have applied for pensions. Some difficulty has arisen in ascertaining the age of some of these applicants, but the Board of Inland Revenue are making arrangements to meet it.

Pension Committees' Accounts.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, seeing that in Financial Instruction No. 8, for pension committees and sub-committees, issued by the Treasury on 29th August, 1908, the clerk of the county council is directed to review and check the accounts of pension committees and sub-committees and to submit a claim to the Treasury for the amount, he will say what authority the Treasury has for calling upon the clerk of the county council to perform duties in connection with the Old-Age Pensions Act; whether the Treasury propose to remunerate the clerk of the county council; who will defray the amount of such claim which the Treasury may, after audit, decide to disallow; and whether the instructions, as distinguished from regulations under the Act, have any validity or binding force.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The duty of making advances to provide for the immediate payment of the expenses of pension committees has been put upon the appointing council by No. 25 of the regulations under the Act, and the duty of accounting for expenditure out of such advances is a necessary condition of recovering the amount expended from the Treasury. Under Section 10 (4) of the Act the Treasury has power, independently of regulations, to determine the amount which shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament for the expenses of pension committees. As the hon. Member is aware, however, Regulation 25 is now under reconsideration, and arrangements will be made for relieving the appointing councils of the duties in question.

Warwickshire Territorials.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Leaflet No. 2, entitled Service in the Territorial Force, on page 5 stated that the Territorial soldier is entitled to pay at Army rates, including the extra emoluments paid in certain corps while in camp, and that the armourers of the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th battalions Royal Warwick regiment were paid during their recent training 2s. 9d. per day; and whether, seeing that the Army rates of pay at this time were 4s. 6d. per day, he will order the balance due to be paid to these armourers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 4s. 6d. is the rate for an armourer sergeant of the Regular Army Ordnance Corps, a highly-skilled rating which does not exist in the Territorial Force; 2s. 9d was specially fixed as a suitable rate for Territorial infantry armourer sergeants, a rating which does not exist in the Regular Army, pending consideration of their position and duties.

The Postmaster-General's Visit to Bradford—Call for the Military.

Mr. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the exact terms of the communication which the Mayor of Bradford recently addressed to the military authorities requesting troops to be held in readiness to assist the civil authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The exact terms are as follows:—"The public authorities are apprehensive of there being a disturbance in the city to-morrow (Friday) evening on the occasion of a political meeting to be held in St. George's Hall. I trust that no disturbance will take place other than what the police will be able to cope with. I think, however, that it would be desirable that you should have as many of your men as can conveniently be spared in readiness, should the police authorities communicate with you and ask for your assistance." The hon. Member will notice that my reply to this Question on the 3rd instant gave substantially the terms of the communication.

Special Reserve and the Unemployed.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he has any record of the number of applicants to join the Special Reserve, and the percentage of applicants who have actually enlisted; and if he is aware that the majority of applicants to enlist have believed that the engagement in the Special Reserve is for six months only, and that, on learning that it is a six years engagement, in the majority of cases they retire.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Returns of the numbers of men applying to enlist into the Special Reserve are not forwarded to the War Office. No information has been received at the War Office to bear out the allegation contained in the last part of the Question; and, in view of the fact that the term of six years service is clearly set forth on the recruiting poster, the statement is not understood.

Army Boot Contracts.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the number of pairs of boots and shoes required for the Army this year are equal to the number of pairs ordered in other years; whether any of the contractors are behind with their deliveries, and, if so, to what extent and for what reason; and whether he is aware that there is no dearth of labour in Northamptonshire but much unemployment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The figures given in reply to a Question put by my hon. friend on 15th October contain the information required in the first part of the Question. As regards the rest of the Question, speaking generally, the deliveries are in advance of those of any year in recent times, there are few arrears, and only of slight extent. I am informed that there are unemployed hands in Northamptonshire.

Price of Army Boots.

MR. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the average price per pair paid for Army ankle boots during 1907 and 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It would be contrary to the practice of my Department to disclose the prices, and I regret, therefore, that I cannot furnish my hon. friend with the information for which he asks.

Cape of Good Hope Licence and Stamp Fees.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the new Act of the Government of the Cape of Good Hope relating to licences and stamps; whether there has been a very large increase in the fees payable by agents for foreign firms; whether British agents in the Cape of Good Hope would in consequence have to pay these higher fees; and, if so, whether he would make such representations as he may think advisable on behalf of these agents and British trade.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) Yes, Sir. The Cape Stamp and Licences Act imposes large increases in the fees payable by agents of foreign firms. As the expression "foreign firm" applies to all (even those in South Africa) which are not domiciled in the Cape Colony the higher fees are payable by agents of firms in this country. The Secretary of State has been in communication on the subject with the Cape Government who stated that it has been found necessary to revise the tariffs for all licences with a view to obtaining increased revenue. He will, however, communicate with the Governor again.

Postage of English Trade Circulars Abroad.

MR. HYDE (Wednesbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the growing practice amongst English traders (owing to the advantage of four per cent. in the postage) of sending to be posted on the Continent, with five centime stamps, certain of their circulars intended for delivery within the United Kingdom; and whether, to prevent the consequent loss to the Post Office due to the division of postage and to secure the like benefit to the trader, he will authorise postmasters to receive and stamp with ½d., such circulars posted in large quantities at the rate of 500 to the £1.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is no reason to think that the practice referred to in the Question is adopted to any appreciable extent; and I am inclined to doubt whether the slight saving in postage which could be effected would counter-balance the various items of expense involved in sending circulars abroad to be posted. I do not consider it advisable to reduce the rate of postage on inland circulars posted in large quantities.

Police Ambulances in London.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsy): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what was the total number of police wheeled-litter ambulances in the metropolitan area in each year from 1891 to 1907; and the total number at the present time.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The earlier figures cannot readily be given, but it may be assumed that previous to 1903 there was an ambulance at every police station. The total number of police ambulances on 31st December of the undermentioned years was: 1903, 190; 1904, 192; 1905, 198; 1906, 203; 1907, 263; 31st October, 1908, 278.

International Copyright Conference—British Delegates.

MR. COOPER: To ask the President of the Board of Trade who are the British delegates to the International Copyright Conference now sitting at Berlin; whether any of the British have had any legal training in English copyright law; and, if not, for what reasons have they been selected.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The principal delegate is Sir Henry Bergne, who attended the International Conference on Copyright in 1885, 1886.

and 1896, and was a plenipotentiary for the signature of the Convention of 1886 and the Additional Act of 1896. The second delegate is Mr. Askwith, K.C., Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trade, who, I need hardly say, is a highly-trained lawyer, and who is at present in charge of the Department concerned with copyright. The third delegate is Count de Salis, Councillor of Embassy at Berlin. The first was selected owing to the important part which he has taken officially for the past thirty years in all negotiations connected with the subject; the second for his legal knowledge; and the third in accordance with the usual practice in the case of international conferences, which is that one of our delegates should be a diplomatist.

Worcester Quarter Sessions—Shorthand Writers' Fees.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that, at the last County Quarter Sessions at Worcester, owing to the refusal of local shorthand writers to undertake the work of official note-taking at the fee allowed by the Treasury, the work of the Court had to be suspended until a shorthand writer from the county council offices was brought in, and that even then only one Court instead of two could be held; whether he is aware also that at Worcester City Sessions, three weeks earlier, there was a similar deadlock until, as the result of an appeal by the Recorder to the reporter of a Birmingham newspaper on public grounds to act and to his editor to allow him to act, this reporter consented to act and the business then proceeded in one Court instead of two; and whether, in view of these difficulties, and of the difficulties occurring at other Courts since The Criminal Appeal Act, 1907,came into force, and of the general dissatisfaction with the Treasury allowance expressed by shorthand writers, steps will be taken to raise the fee to an amount more commensurate with the exacting and responsible nature of the duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The two cases mentioned have been brought to my notice, but I am not aware that such difficulties have been in any way general. The remuneration offered is in practical accordance with the rate usually paid by the Government in legal and other cases, and I am not prepared to raise it.

Regent's Park Lake.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he will state when the ornamental lake in Regent's Park was last drained and cleaned; and whether he will consider the advisability of directing that such work be undertaken during the present winter.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The lake in Regent's Park was last drained and cleaned as a whole in 1867. A portion of the lake at the north-east corner was drained and cleaned last winter, and a portion at the south-east corner is being drained and cleaned now by the "unemployed."

Chartered Company of Rhodesia.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Chartered Company of Rhodesia have requested His Majesty's Government to guarantee a loan for £10,000,000 in the interest of railway and other enterprises in Africa; and, if so, whether the Government has definitely declined to do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The hon. Member is mistaken as to the form of the request made by the British South African Company. Through their solicitor they invited the Treasury to guarantee the interest on railway debenture issues in Rhodesia, but His Majesty's Government felt obliged to inform them that, while they were in sympathy with the good administrative work which is being done under the charter, they could not give the company a guarantee.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Liquor Contracts.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the First

Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty are bound by any agreement or undertaking, or is otherwise under any obligation, to obtain a supply of any intoxicating liquor from any particular person or persons; if so, what are the names of the persons; and what breweries, distilleries, or licensed premises they represent.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Such liquors as are bought directly by the Admiralty are obtained in the open market by competition in the usual way. As regards canteens in naval shore establishments, the supply of liquor is not purchased by the Admiralty, but is provided by the general contractor for canteen supplies under arrangement with the naval officer in charge. The Admiralty policy is against anything in the nature of a tied system with any particular firm of brewers for wet canteens, and where anything of that nature still exists, steps will be taken on the termination of the current local agreement to regulate any fresh arrangement in accordance with the policy referred to.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: Arising out of that Answer, and seeing that the right hon. Gentleman has not answered my Questions, may I ask, Can he say definitely whether the Government are bound or not by any contract; and further, is there any contract with the proprietor or owner of a public-house known as the "Coach and Horses"; also, how many of these canteens are tied at the present time?

MR. MCKENNA: I have answered the Questions completely. The hon. Member asked whether the Admiralty are bound by any agreement or undertaking, or are otherwise under any obligation, to obtain a supply of any intoxicating liquor from any particular person or persons. My Answer is in the negative.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Is it not a fact that all the rum bought by the Admiralty at the present time, and for years past, has been bought under an agreement with a firm of brokers in the City?

MR. MCKENNA: I must ask for notice of that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): Perhaps I may be allowed to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his Answer did not deal with the Admiralty in its centralised capacity in London, or does it mean that there are no contracts with the Government at Portsmouth, for instance, or Devonport or any other place with individual suppliers of liquor?

MR. MCKENNA: There are contracts, but I have endeavoured as well as I could in my Answer to draw a distinction between wet naval canteens and Admiralty contracts. Under Admiralty contracts liquor is invariably bought in the open market by open competition, but the canteens are not Admiralty contracts. In this case there have been past contracts extending over a period of three years, but it is proposed in the future to bring all such contracts to an end and to insist upon the Admiralty policy being adopted in regard to canteens.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Arising out of that Answer and the cross-examination of my right hon. friend, may I ask whether the best way of overcoming the difficulties suggested in the various Questions would not be for the Admiralty to give up purchasing liquor?

MR. H. C. LEA: Certainly not.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not want unduly to press the right hon. Gentleman, but we are anxious to know exactly what the system is. I understand that arrangements are made to buy in the open market, and of course we have nothing to say against that, but is the arrangement made with a firm of brewers for a week, a month, two months, six months, or for any period? For how long are these open market agreements made?

MR. MCKENNA: I have no knowledge on that point, but no doubt the contracts for delivery of beer which might be ordered would extend over a considerable period. But the contract with any particular brewer would be made in open competition with other brewers.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: I asked the right hon. Gentleman if he could give us the names of persons, and I repeat it now, and can he tell us if there is any contract with the owner or proprietor of the "Coach and Horses"?

MR. McKENNA: I have no knowledge at all of the "Coach and Horses."

German Workmen on British Contracts.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, whether firms located in Great Britain but employing German workmen have been entrusted with work in various dockyards in preference to firms employing only British labour; and whether the foreign workmen have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the confidential arrangements of dockyards at home and in British Dependencies.

MR. McKENNA: I have understood from a private communication from the hon. Member that he refers to a contract at Gibraltar, and I am telegraphing to the dockyard for information as to whether any foreign workmen have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the confidential arrangements of the yard—or whether any foreign workmen have been employed at all.

The Home Fleet.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the ten battleships and thirteen cruisers officially stated to have taken part in the recent cruise of the Home Fleet were fully manned; how many had nucleus crews; what were the names of the two battleships exercising independently; and were they fully manned ships.

MR. McKENNA: Four battleships and six cruisers were fully manned; the remainder had nucleus crews. H.M. ships "Vengeance" and "Mars," the two battleships which were exercising independently had nucleus crews.

The Channel Fleet.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what was the strength of the Channel Fleet in battleships when it left Portland on the 23rd September.

I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what were the names of the battleships with the Channel Fleet when it left Portland on the 23rd September; and what were the names of the battleships withdrawn for repairs, and by whose order they were so withdrawn.

MR. McKENNA: The following battleships were with the Channel Fleet when it left Portland:—"Africa," "Commonwealth," "Hibernia," "King Edward VII.," "London," and "Venerable." The following were withdrawn for alterations and repairs:—"Britannia," "Bulwark," "Dominion," "Hindustan," "New Zealand," "Triumph." The remaining two battleships, "Irresistible" and "Swiftsure," did not proceed on cruise on 23rd September, as they were due for refit soon after that date. The "Bulwark" was withdrawn by Admiralty Order; the other battleships undergoing refit were approved by the Admiralty to be taken in hand, the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet having submitted a programme of refits showing the desirability of such action.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): The right hon. Gentleman says one battleship was withdrawn by Admiralty Order. Is it not the case that no battleship can be withdrawn unless by Admiralty Order, so that the whole of the eight must have been so withdrawn?

MR. McKENNA: There were not eight, but six. I stated further that the other battleships were undergoing refit and that was approved by the Admiralty to be taken in hand, the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet having submitted a programme of refit showing the desirability of such action.

MR. BELLAIRS: Does not the sole responsibility for ships being away rest with the Admiralty?

MR. McKENNA: Yes, Sir; but the Admiralty issue their Order on the recommendations of the Commander-in-Chief, and in this case the recommendation was made by the Commander-in-Chief.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): May I ask whether it was by the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief that these six ships were absent at the same time?

MR. McKENNA: It is only by taking one particular date that one arrives at the fact that these six ships were absent. If another date had been chosen it would have been found that fewer ships would have been absent.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am sorry to press the right hon. Gentleman, but that is not an Answer to my Question. I did not attach any importance to any particular date, but I understand that at a particular period, and at the date given in the Question, a certain number of ships were absent in the Fleet. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that they were absent in consequence of a scheme submitted by the Commander-in-Chief. Was it in accordance with the Commander-in-Chief's recommendation that they were absent at that particular time?

MR. McKENNA: Certainly; he had recommended a programme which involved the absence of the ships.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: May I ask whether that recommendation applies not only to the ships themselves, but to the time for which the ships are to be withdrawn?

MR. McKENNA: The recommendation covers both the particular ships and the period. The programme was particularly appropriate on this occasion, because two days after two of the ships had finished their refit.

Education in Bombay.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government of Bombay has issued a Resolution expressing regret that the advance of education in that presidency has been accompanied in recent years by a lowering of the standard of manners in schools and colleges, that this is due in some measure to the tendency of masters, boys, and students to associate themselves with political demonstrations, in which the way of anarchy is prepared; and, if the Answer be in the affirmative, whether he will place a copy of the said Resolution in the Library.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The Resolution referred to has been printed in the public Press, and the Secretary of State does not think that anything would be gained by placing a copy in the Library.

*MR. REES: In view of this statement as to the result of the present system, will the Government consider the propriety of changing the system?

MR. BUCHANAN: I hardly think that arises out of the Question.

His Majesty's Proclamation to India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to state when the measures of reform in India which are foreshadowed in His Majesty's gracious proclamation will be made known to the House.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State is not able to state when the measures of reform will be laid before Parliament. No time is being lost. The hon. Member will easily understand that a good deal of communication with the Government of India is necessary. An Act of no great length will be necessary for certain of the proposals, but the Bill cannot be introduced this session.

SIR H. COTTON: Does the hon. Gentleman apprehend that a statement will be made on the subject this session?

MR. BUCHANAN: I have given the fullest answer I can to the Question.

Indian Reforms.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether a Departmental Committee has been appointed to consider the measures of reform in India which are foreshadowed in His Majesty's gracious proclamation; and, if so, will he state the names of the members of the Committee.

MR. BUCHANAN: On the 15th October in answer to a Question by the hon. Member I stated that the question of reform in Indian Administration was under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council, and that he was not in a position to make any further statement. I have nothing at present to add to that reply.

Sir H. COTTON: Is it a fact that no Departmental Committee has been appointed?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not think it is quite reasonable to ask as to the methods by which the Secretary of State is endeavouring to form the best judgment and to get from a very wide circle advice on the very important matters involved.

*Mr. REES: Do the Government of India contemplate any reforms in the direction of strengthening its hands for the suppression of sedition and the punishment of crime?

Mr. BUCHANAN: There again I hardly think my hon. friend's Question arises out of the Question on the Paper.

Amnesty of Prisoners in India.

Sir H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he will grant a return of the number of prisoners, and the character of the offences committed by those prisoners, who have been released or whose sentences have been reduced under the terms of His Majesty's gracious proclamation to the princes and people of India.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State regrets that it is not practicable to comply with the hon. Member's request. The benefit of His Majesty's clemency under the proclamation will extend to the general mass of the prisoners in India in proportion to the length of their sentences and irrespective of the nature of the offences for which they were convicted. Sentences of a year and upwards are reduced by a month for every year of sentence. Similar reductions are made in sentences of under a year.

Sir H. COTTON asked, if nothing special, nothing other than the ordinary gaol delivery was intended, why such exceptional prominence was given to the release of prisoners in His Majesty's gracious proclamation.

Mr. BUCHANAN said there was something special, inasmuch as every man who was under sentence on 2nd November got a month off his sentence, if his sentence lasted more than a year, with a proportionate reduction if the sentence was less than a year.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) asked whether that was any more than was customarily given to men who behaved themselves properly while they were in prison.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Prisoners will not forfeit any reduction of sentence which is consequent upon good behaviour in prison.

*Mr. REES asked whether the Government would except from this benefit all those who have been convicted of spreading sedition amongst the people of India.

Mr. BUCHANAN: There is no distinction drawn with regard to offences.

The Maharajah of Burdwan.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether His Majesty's Government desire to make any public acknowledgement of the courageous and patriotic conduct of the Maharajah of Burdwan in helping to save the life of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I am sure that His Majesty's Government and this House fully appreciate and admire the brave conduct of the Maharajah of Burdwan, and that the Maharajah himself will feel that heroic conduct and its public acknowledgement are its own best reward.

Transvaal Civil Service.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the number of new posts created in the Transvaal Civil Service since the assumption of responsible government; how many English and Dutch, respectively, have been appointed; and of these how many respectively have been transferred from other posts which have been abolished or otherwise.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Transvaal Government do not classify their Civil servants as English and Dutch. It has never been the custom for self-governing Colonies to furnish returns of appointments to their Civil Service. The Transvaal and Orange River Colony Governments have recently furnished the Secretary of State with very full returns of reductions made in their Civil Services. These returns have cost the two Governments much time and labour, and the Secretary of State recognises that the preparation of these documents has been a special act of courtesy on their part. The Agent-General for the Transvaal has informed me that he has general information from his Government that new appointments to the Transvaal Civil Service have shown no preponderance in favour of either English or Dutch, but for the reasons given the Secretary of State cannot take the very unusual course of asking the Transvaal Government to go to further trouble and expense.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked the hon. and gallant Gentleman whether he would give the House the information to which he had referred in his Answer; was it based on the Return sent by the Transvaal Government? He had clearly stated that there had been a greater number of English officials appointed to the Civil Service than of Dutch.

COLONEL SEELY: I do not know to what the hon. Gentleman refers. I have stated, what has been stated on more than one occasion, that no racial favouritism whatever is shown; and that, indeed, is the fact. And with regard to the refusal, which I now make, to ask the Transvaal Government to furnish this Return, I may say that there is every indication, as the hon. Gentleman will find if he refers to the Agent-General, who has furnished me with this information, that there is no racial antagonism of any kind shown in these appointments; but we cannot ask a self-governing Colony to go to great trouble and expense to prepare a Return, especially when the form of the Question implies a reflection on the Government.

Natal Native Administration.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can explain why the Colonial Office has not yet received a copy of the Bill to provide for the better administration of native affairs, which has been read a third time and passed by both Houses of the Natal Parliament, and was published in the *Natal Government Gazette* of 1st September ultimo.

COLONEL SEELY: The *Natal Gazette* of 1st September contains the Bill as read a third time and passed by the Legislative Assembly. There is nothing in the *Gazette* to indicate that the Bill was then in its final form, and I observe from the Natal Press that three weeks later the Prime Minister in the Legislative Council moved to retransmit the Bill to the Legislative Assembly certified correct as passed by the Legislative Council with certain Amendments made therein by the Legislative Council. I do not know what these Amendments were.

*MR. BYLES: Does not the Bill transfer the duty of protecting the natives formerly imposed on the representative of the Crown to permanent officials of the Natal Government?

COLONEL SEELY: The Bill in its final form has not been received as yet.

The Pacific Phosphate Company.

MR. H. C. LEA: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table the High Commissioner's Report of his inquiry into the allegations made against the Pacific Phosphate Company, and also a copy of the leases and licences obtained by the company on the guano phosphate island, Paanopa.

The hon. Member also had the following Questions down on the same subject:—

To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Pacific Phosphate Company, of which Lord Stanmore, an ex-Commissioner of the Western Pacific, is chairman, holds on a nominal payment a valuable guano phosphate concession in the Gilbert Islands, Western Pacific; whether his attention has been called to the allegations that have been made that, by a system of unjust taxation, ill-treatment of natives, and general mal-administration, Colonial officials have assisted the interests of this company, and that these allegations have never been thoroughly and independently investigated; and whether he proposes to hold any inquiry into the matter.

To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the two inquiries into the allegations impugning the Pacific Phosphate Company and the connivance of the Colonial officials, whether he is aware that both were held after long delay; that, in the first inquiry, the complainants' witnesses were not present; that the second inquiry was made by the High Commissioner alone, and not on the spot; and will he explain why the Colonial Office has refused to publish the same.

To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will explain why the Government have disclaimed responsibility for the Gilbert Island natives being deprived of their guano phosphate property on the ground that Paanopa was not then British territory, seeing that some years before the Pacific Islands Company obtained any lease of these phosphate beds Paanopa had come under British rule through a treaty with Germany, which divided that portion of the Pacific between the two Powers.

COLONEL SEELY: I will answer together the four Questions of my hon. friend on the subject. The Pacific Phosphate Company occupies Ocean Island (the native name of which is Paanopa) on a licence under which the company pays a royalty of 6d. per ton on the phosphates exported. This royalty, which now amounts to more than £3,000 a year, has hitherto been paid to the Imperial Exchequer, but arrangements have been made by which it will in future be paid to the Government of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate. I shall be happy to communicate copies of the licences to my hon. friend, but the Secretary of State doubts whether they are of sufficient public interest to justify their being laid before Parliament. Ocean Island did not become part of His Majesty's Dominions under the Anglo-German agreement of 1886, but was annexed in 1900. A report concerning the only allegations against the company which have reached the Secretary of State is being laid on the Table. The earlier inquiry to which my hon. friend refers related to other islands in the Gilbert group, and had nothing to do with the Pacific Phosphate Company, or with Ocean Island.

MR. H. C. LEA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this company get a lease from the natives practically under false pretences during the time the island was under the protection of the British Government, although the flag had not actually been hoisted, and that——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member had better put the Question on the Paper.

British and Canadian Trade.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the bonding privileges which enable Great Britain and Canada to send goods to one another through United States territory in bond are the subject of treaty; and, if so, who are the parties of the treaty; is the treaty for a definite period, and what period; it is subject to termination by either party, and on what notice; and, if no such treaty exists, what are the arrangements under which these bonding privileges are in force.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The bonding privileges referred to in the Question of the hon. Member are based on Article 29 of the Treaty of Washington of 1871, and although the Fishery Articles of that Treaty were subsequently denounced, the article in question in the view of His Majesty's Government is still in force, though on this point a different view is entertained by the United States. Its provisions have, however, in practice been acted upon ever since.

German Prosecution of British Trawler.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the arrest of the British steam trawler "Taurus" by a German gunboat, on the 14th May last, and of the trial of Captain George Barker, at the Royal Provincial Court at Flensburg, on the 24th August, when he was fined 300 marks and the vessel's gear and voyage confiscated; whether he is aware that at the trial it was admitted that the commander took no cross-bearings or angles, that he stated he took soundings and that the vessel was in 9 feet of water, whereas the ship draws 13 feet; whether the Court refused to recognise the vessel's chart, and that the Court in giving judgment charged the captain with carrying an inaccurate chart of the waters on that coast; whether he is aware that the chart in question was one of Close's charts, which was prepared under the surveys of Commander Lindup of the British Admiralty, who has since seen the chart and guarantees its accuracy; and whether the Foreign Office are aware of any difference between the German and English charts as to the limit-line in these waters, or whether the Germans are entitled to fix the three-mile limit-line where they choose and arrest British vessels without notice.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Acting under my instructions, the British Vice-Consul at Finsburg was present in the Court at the trial of the master of the British steam trawler "Taurus." I am not aware of the admissions and statements attributed by the hon. Member to the commander of the German gunboat. As regards the chart in use on the "Taurus," no authority was given to Mr. Lindup, a chief officer of coastguard, to assist Mr. Close in preparing the chart, and any assistance given by him to Mr. Close was unofficial. I understand that Mr. Close did consult him privately in the matter. I am in communication with the Admiralty as to any difference which may exist between the British and German charts. The German authorities are of course bound by the definition of the exclusive fishery limits contained in Article 2 of the North Sea Fisheries (Police) Convention of 1882, which runs as follows:—"The fishermen of each country shall enjoy the exclusive right of fishery within the distance of three miles from low-water mark along the whole extent of the coasts of their respective countries, as well as of the dependent islands and banks."

Persian Constitution.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Shah of Persia has announced his intention to promulgate a rescript abolishing the Constitution; whether the representations made by His Majesty's Government in concert with that of Russia to the Shah, having in view the summoning of a Parliament according to the Constitution, are being renewed; and whether it is proposed that any limitations should be placed on freedom of election and control by Parliament of the national Budget.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information that the Shah of Persia has abrogated the Persian Constitution, and refused to convoke the Parliament.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In reply to a petition presented on November 7th, the Shah promised to instruct the Grand Vizier in the sense desired by the petitioners, that is to say, that the Constitution should be abandoned; but he has not yet issued a rescript to this effect. Representations such as the hon. Member alludes to were renewed on 8th November, subsequent to the events described above, but were of a general character, and did not go into the constitutional details referred to in the last part of the Question.

Ex-Constable George Reed.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the evidence of ex-Constable George Reed before the Royal Commission of Metropolitan Police, and the statement made by the chairman in connection with his evidence; and whether he intends instituting proceedings against him for perjury.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): My right hon. friend would refer the hon. Member to the reply which he returned to a similar Question on the 8th August, 1907. The Royal Commission have made no recommendation on the subject, and my right hon. friend does not propose to take any action in the matter.

Licensing Statistics.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the figures showing the number of new licences granted, the number of licences reduced, and the total number in existence on the 31st March in each year from 1900 to 1908 inclusive.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: All available information on the points mentioned by the hon. Member is given in the Annual Volumes of Licensing Statistics, and the Secretary of State thinks he will find substantially what he wants there. He may refer him to the tables given on page 6 in regard to new on-licences and the annual decrease in existing on-licences and to the table on page 3 in regard to the numbers of on-licences existing in each year.

New Licences and Tied Houses.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of new licences granted under the Act of 1904, and how many of them are subject to a tie in respect of the purchase of liquors.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: In the years 1905–6–7, 165 new on-licences and 601 new off-licences have been granted and confirmed in England and Wales. My right hon. friend has no information as to how many of these licences are tied; but he may say that under Section 4 of the Act of 1904, which empowers them to impose conditions on new on-licences, the justices have in three cases laid down that the licence is not to become tied.

Lancashire Cotton Trade Disputes.

MR. HAWORTH (Manchester, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the recent dispute in the Lancashire cotton-spinning trade, which resulted in an extensive stoppage of machinery before the contending parties could settle their differences, he will consider the advisability of taking steps, by legislation or otherwise, to secure the adoption of an automatic sliding-scale to regulate wages according to the state of trade, and so avoid strikes or lock-outs in the future in cases for which the Brooklands agreement has proved inadequate.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I am deeply impressed with the urgent importance of this matter. While I am of opinion that neither employers nor employed would desire the establishment by law of an automatic sliding-scale to regulate wages and that both would prefer that questions respecting the setting up of such machinery for avoiding disputes should be decided in the main by the interests directly concerned, I can assure my hon. friend that the Board of Trade would be prepared to lend their best assistance, if desired, in the furtherance of negotiations between those interests. I propose to communicate with the various parties in this sense.

Shipping Regulations.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state for what reasons the Board of Trade have postponed the application to foreign vessels within British ports of the provisions of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, relating to load-line, defective equipment, the stowage of grain cargoes, and life saving appliances.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Act of 1906 provides that the British rules as to load-line and life-saving appliances are to be applied to foreign ships in our ports on some date during 1909, to be prescribed, the intention being to allow as long a time as is reasonably required to enable foreign Governments to make any necessary alterations in their rules. Voluntary action on the part of foreign Governments is in every way preferable to the bare enforcement of our standard in United Kingdom ports. The negotiations with foreign Governments are progressing very favourably, and the date selected, 1st October next, will, I hope, admit of this voluntary action being completed in the case of the principal maritime Powers.

Birmingham Gun Trade.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the practice of the

English proof houses, both in Birmingham and in London, of proof-marking foreign-made barrels and firearms with the same proof marks as those put upon British-made barrels and firearms, and to the fact that this practice is taken advantage of by importers and Continental makers to send their goods to the English proof houses instead of to the proof houses in the countries of origin for the purpose of obtaining English proof marks and thereby passing off the goods so marked as of British make; and, if so, what steps do His Majesty's Government propose to take to prevent the deception.

MR. CHURCHILL: I understand that the views held by different sections of the English gun trade on this difficult matter are widely divergent, and that whilst all parties agree that imported barrels might with advantage be marked differently from British, the gunmakers are opposed to the desire of the barrel makers, that barrels made from tubes imported in the rough should also be marked as foreign. A conference on the subject between representatives of these interests was held at the Board of Trade in 1904, but without result. I am at any time prepared to consider proposals for a further conference which may be made to me on behalf of the parties interested, but while the trade is so divided in opinion it is not possible for me to take action in the sense desired by the right hon. Member.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Will my right hon. friend take steps to ascertain whether or not the so-called gunmakers who are opposed to this change are gunmakers at all, or simply importers of guns whom the present system—so bad for the workmen—suits?

MR. CHURCHILL: I will submit the statement of my right hon. friend to my advisors at the Board of Trade.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is it a fact, as suggested in this Question, that this unpatriotic system is practised in Birmingham?

British Investments Abroad.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has any materials from which he can give an estimate of the amount of British capital sent abroad during each of the years from 1900 to 1907.

MR. CHURCHILL: I know of no satisfactory means of making such an estimate.

MR. FELL: Have not the Board of Trade on several occasions made estimates based on income-tax returns, showing the revenue derived from foreign investments?

MR. CHURCHILL: That is not the information I have, nor do I think it would be satisfactory.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): Is it not the fact that banks and houses using coupons or foreign bonds make a declaration with regard to them? Could not the returns be made up from them?

MR. CHURCHILL: That seems to fall within the purview of the Treasury.

Underground Railway Employees and Conciliation Boards.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can say what steps are being taken, if any, by the Central London and other underground electric railway companies for the establishment of conciliation boards with their workmen.

MR. CHURCHILL: As I have informed my hon. friend the Member for Derby, the Board of Trade are now in correspondence with the Central London Company on this subject. As regards other underground electric lines, conciliation boards have already been established for the Great Northern and City Railway, and an election of the men's representatives is about to take place on the Metropolitan Railway. I do not know whether any steps are being taken for the formation of conciliation boards on the Metropolitan District Railway and the group of tube railways controlled by the Underground Electric Railways Company, but, as my hon. friend will be aware, the circumstances of these lines differ from those of most other lines.

MR. HUDSON asked if more than a year had not elapsed since the arrangement was made between the Board of Trade and the companies, did not these men apply to have a board formed more than six months ago, and would steps be taken to press the matter to a conclusion.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade are in constant communication with an increasing and substantial measure of success with the companies in order to bring these boards into existence, and if the Central London Company has lagged behind it has not been our fault.

Administration of the Distress Fund.

MR. W. THORNE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that, in consequence of the central and various local distress committees not receiving the Circular withdrawing the two disqualifications, viz., poor law relief and two successive years work, a large number of men are being prevented from obtaining work; and if he can state when the Circular will be issued removing the two disqualifications mentioned.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): An Order dealing with this matter was issued yesterday, and copies of it, together with an explanatory Circular, have been sent to the local bodies concerned.

MR. W. THORNE: What is the difference between the alteration and the old Orders?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Full discretion is given to the distress committees.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON, (Durham, Barnard Castle): May I ask whether leaving to the discretion of the local committees the two points referred to in the Prime Minister's recent speech—the poor law disqualification and having one's name on the distress register for two years—is what the House were led to expect?

MR. JOHN BURNS: It is generally regarded by those responsible for the administration of the Act that this is by far the best and most effective way of giving expression to the Prime Minister's promise.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: But may I ask whether it is not setting aside the intention of the Prime Minister's speech to leave it in the discretion of the authorities whether the disqualifications definitely promised to be removed have been allowed to remain?

MR. JOHN BURNS: That is not the view of the distress committees.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): Will the modifications take place from the date of the Prime Minister's speech or that of the issue of the Local Government Board's Circular?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I presume they will take effect from yesterday, when the Circular was issued.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Are we to understand that these poor men who are now registered as disqualified will not be allowed to come in. I put that to the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E): I should like to have notice of that Question.

Valuation of Corporate Property.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the value of £241,000,000 set on the corporate property and undertakings of the councils of boroughs, other than Metropolitan boroughs, in England and Wales, according to the Return obtained in 1904, represented in whole or in part the original cost of the undertakings and works.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The value of the assets comprised in the total of £241,000,000 was estimated in different ways in different boroughs. In some cases the original cost was apparently taken as the estimated value. The remarks in column 12 of the Return contain further information on the point, and I will send a copy of the Return to the hon. Member.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Does that £241,000,000 represent the depreciated value?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The hon. Gentleman had better peruse the Return and draw his own inference.

West Ham Distress Committee.

Mr. W. THORNE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the West Ham Distress Committee received any grant from the £300,000 granted by the Government to assist the unemployed for the year ending 1908–9.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: It has not at present been necessary for a payment to be made to the distress committee out of the Grant for 1908–9, as they have in hand a considerable balance from the Grant for 1907–8. I have already authorised the appropriation of £1,520 from this balance towards works upon which men registered with the distress committee will be employed, and I hope to be able to assent to further appropriations very shortly.

Housing and Town Planning Bill.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the many difficulties of construction, and of law, which have arisen, and are likely to arise, in the discussion of the Housing and Town Planning Bill; and whether he will take steps to secure for the Standing Committee the presence of some legal assistance.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I have already made arrangements which will, I hope, give us the advantage of the presence of one of the law officers on the Committee next week.

Lord R. CECIL: Will he be present continuously or only for five minutes at a time as was the case to-day?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: It is very difficult to guarantee the attendance of a law officer or indeed of any lawyer either in or outside this House.

Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the receipt of poor relief by a husband during the present year disqualifies the wife, who is otherwise fully qualified to receive a pension, from receiving a pension.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): At the same time may I ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the position under the Old-Age Pensions Act of an aged couple over the age of seventy years who have received outrelief from the Poor Law, which does not recognise the wife's claim to its assistance so long as the husband lives; and whether the wife can claim a pension under the Pensions Act.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I am taking the opinion of the law officers with respect to the point raised in this Question, so that at the moment a definite reply cannot be given to it.

Mombasa Mail Service.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state approximately the number of letters conveyed by the British India Steamship Company to Mombasa, and approximately the cost to the country of each letter; and whether, in view of the fact that there is practically no passenger traffic on the said line, he will consider the advisability in future arrangements of insisting that the service should be an adequate one.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The number of articles from the United Kingdom, excluding parcels, conveyed by the British India Steam Navigation Company on the mail service from Aden to Mombasa and Zanzibar is estimated at 145,000 per annum. The company also conveys about 380,000 articles per annum, originating in British possessions and foreign countries. The cost of conveying each letter cannot be stated, as the payment to the company is made in a lump sum covering the conveyance of all letter mails and parcel mails in both directions and between several ports. The question of revising this contract is under the consideration of His Majesty's Government.

Postal Split Duties.

Mr. W. THORNE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what number of extra men would be permanently employed by the Post Office if the present system of split duties worked by London postmen was abolished.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The information required by the hon. Member is not available. Unfortunately, as recognised by the Parliamentary Committee, split duties cannot be abolished.

Christmas Pay in the Post Office.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any instructions have been issued to postmasters in the provinces relating to the pay per hour to be given to the extra staff employed during the pressure of Christmas business; whether, according to this instruction, the maximum is now to be 6d., but may be as low as 4d. per hour; whether in any case the scale hitherto paid has been over 6d.; and upon what basis the alteration, if any, has been made.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: It recently came to my notice that in certain cases the rates paid to the staff temporarily employed in the Post Office during the Christmas season were lower than those on which the wages of auxiliary postmen are based. I have therefore caused instructions to be issued that the rates of pay for the temporary force should, as far as possible, be based on the rates recommended by the Select Committee for auxiliary service. The lowest rates payable under these conditions will be 4½d. an hour, and this will be applicable only to Class 5—that is, the smallest offices. Higher rates than 6d. an hour will be paid where the auxiliary rates are not considered to be sufficient remuneration for the performance of certain duties which may be required. Besides the fixed wage the men receive special pay for night work, for Christmas Day and Boxing Day and get overtime when it has to be worked.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Will the wages paid hitherto be lowered in any case?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: As I explained the other day in reference to the Leeds case, there is to be a reduction of the rate per hour, but in the end the aggregate amount received by the man will exceed that paid last year.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): You are reducing the rate and making the man work twice the time in order to keep up his wages.

London and Paris Mail Service.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he would state the official time occupied by the longest of the mail services between the two capitals of London and Paris via Dover and Calais, and the quickest time occupied by the mail service between the same cities via Boulogne and Folkestone

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The longest time occupied in any of the mail services between London and Paris via Dover and Calais is 8 hours 45 minutes, and the shortest time occupied in any of the services by way of Folkestone and Boulogne is 6 hours 45 minutes.

Mr. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been drawn to the shortest of all the routes between London and Paris, viz., via Hastings and Treport, a distance of 238 miles, as compared with 287 miles by the longest of all the routes, via Dover and Calais; and, in view of the increasing rapidity of modern mail steamers, would he consider, in conjunction with the French postal authorities, the possibility of securing an equally rapid and alternative service either via Newhaven and Dieppe with the existing service, or by the proposed service via Hastings and Tréport.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: There is no regular service of steamships between Hastings and Tréport suitable for the transmission of mails; nor, so far as I am aware, are the harbour accommodation and railway facilities on either side by that route adequate for a mail service. I am considering the possibility of sending more of the mails for France by the route of Newhaven and Dieppe.

Mr. PIRIE was understood to suggest that with electrification of the line to Tréport a considerable saving of time would be effected.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am looking into the whole matter, and if my hon. friend can bring any facts before me I will consider them.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, with regard to the mail service between the two capitals of London and Paris, and in view of the fact that there are from London to Paris twenty mail services per week carried by the longer route, via Dover and Calais, as compared with twelve by the shorter route, via Boulogne and Folkestone, and that in the service from Paris to London the weekly differences were greater, being twenty-one by the longer as compared to seven by the shorter route, and as this arrangement is solely in the interests of the railway companies to the detriment of the mail service and of the travelling public, he will endeavour, in conjunction with the French postal authorities, to obtain rectification so that the mails for or passing through Paris may be more often carried by the shorter than by the longer route.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I do not think it can be said that the arrangement to which the hon. Member refers is solely in the interests of the railway companies. The question of modifying the present service in the manner suggested is not by any means free from difficulties. The matter is being carefully considered.

City Postmen's Duties.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state whether the new early morning attendance of E.C. postmen resulted in the expected acceleration in the delivery of the first morning correspondence in the City of London.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The early morning attendance of the E.C. postmen has already resulted in a decided acceleration in the delivery of the first morning correspondence in the City of London and this acceleration may be still further increased in the future.

National Telephone Company.

SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire W.R., Rotherham): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is able to make any further statement either in regard to the discharges by the National Telephone Company in consequence of the nearing of the termination of their lease, or in reference to any arrangements he may have agreed on with them in order to carry on uninterruptedly the construction work.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St.Pancras, W.). I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can give any further information in regard to the discharges by the National Telephone Company in consequence of the nearing of the termination of their lease; and whether he has concluded any arrangements with them in order to carry on the construction work.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am glad to say that, in view of the proposals of the Post Office now under consideration by the National Telephone Company, the company have arranged that, in order to avoid discharges which might otherwise take place consequent on the early termination of their lease, especially during the winter months, they have given instructions that as far as possible employment is to be found, and that if necessary new work proper for the company to undertake, having regard to the termination of its licence, may be put in hand earlier than would otherwise be the case. As regards the continuance of construction works, I have made a proposal for the co-operation of the Post Office with the company, which is now under their consideration.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): Will the right hon. Gentleman take precautions to prevent the company using old cables and other material in the laying of new lines?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If the hon. Member can give me any information I will look into the matter.

Postal Duties in Lincolnshire.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what are the usual ordinary weekly hours for the clerical staff at the head offices at Worksop, Mansfield, Lincoln, Spilsby, Gainsborough, Grimsby, and Brigg; and what are the weekly hours worked during 1908.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: As I informed the hon. Member in reply to a similar Question which he put down for

Monday last, I am having inquiries made; but the information has not yet reached me.

Small Holdings in Gloucestershire.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade how many of the small holders recently announced by him as provided for in the county of Gloucester are ordinary tenants on privately-arranged holdings, and how many are tenants holding direct from the county council of Gloucestershire.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this Question. Out of the seventy applicants for whom holdings have been provided, thirty hold from private landowners and forty are tenants of the county council.

Clyde Pilots Grievance.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, at the trial of Mr. William McKinlay, a Clyde pilot, held at Glasgow on 15th May, 1907, for reckless navigation on the Clyde, there was any nautical assessor with pilotage knowledge assisting the sheriff who tried the case, and, if not, can he say whether, taking into account the highly technical nature of such cases, he will in future have such assessors appointed to assist in such trials; and can he say if this is the practice in the other parts of the United Kingdom.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): I have nothing to add to the Answers given by my right hon. friends the Secretary for Scotland and the President of the Board of Trade on this subject. I have no power to appoint assessors. The practice appears to be the same in the three kingdoms. I may add that should the inquiry into pilotage referred to by the President of the Board of Trade in his Answer on 4th November take place I would be very glad if this question of assessors were included in the investigation.

MR. JOYCE: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that in such cases in England a nautical assessor always assists the Judge?

MR. THOMAS SHAW: According to the information furnished me by the Board of Trade that is not so.

MR. JOYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further on this point?

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I shall be pleased to do so, but I would point out that this was a criminal and not a technical proceeding.

MR. JOYCE: Where did the criminality come in? Was it not the reckless navigation of the naval officer?

Kilmaleg Rent Dispute.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that when one of the Land Commission's inspectors went to inspect the lands of Patrick M'Gann, of Kilmaleg, he declined the request of the tenant to inspect the worst part of the farm; whether the landlady appealed to the decision of the lower Court and that, on account of the bad portion of the land not being inspected, the rent was increased by £1 5s.; and whether, seeing that inspections of this kind are giving general dissatisfaction, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Land Commission inform me that in the case referred to in the Question a judicial rent was fixed by the Land Commission Court of Appeal under Section 88 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. The lay assessor who acted upon the appeal in this case reports that he visited every field on the farm when making his inspection.

Castleconnell Burial Dispute.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the House full particulars of the attack by a Roman Catholic mob on the funeral procession when Mr. Enright's body was being conveyed to the Protestant burial ground in Castleconnell, County Limerick; can he say if the body was interred without any funeral service; have any arrests been made in connection with the case; and, if so, what sentences have been passed.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): Before the right hon. Gentleman replies may I ask him whether Mr. Enright died a Roman Catholic; whether a Roman Catholic clergyman attended him, and whether he died according to the rites of the Catholic Church?

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this gentleman was a member of the Church of Ireland for his whole life, that he was a member of the elected vestry of his church, and that he was an earnest and hard worker in his church for the last forty or fifty years?

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that there was no mob, Catholic or Protestant, on this occasion. Police were present, but as there was no breach of the peace there was no occasion for any arrests. Mr. Enright is believed to have been admitted into the Catholic Church shortly before he died, and, owing to this general belief, the coffin was taken straight to the grave instead of to the church, where the Protestant rector was waiting to read the service. It is understood that the service was read in the Church. With regard to the supplementary Questions, I really deprecate them. It is no doubt a fact that this gentleman, who was the child of a mixed marriage, was a Protestant during the greater part of his life. His father who was a Protestant died, and he lived with his mother who was a Roman Catholic. It is undoubtedly a fact that during the last days of his life he wished to join the Catholic Church. He did so and he died in that faith.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Was the body interred without any burial service, and if this man died a Roman Catholic, was the service read by a Roman Catholic clergyman?

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that no Catholic priest was present on the occasion. The service was read in the Protestant church.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: When the right hon. Gentleman says that in his latter days this gentleman turned Roman Catholic, does he mean that he did so within a few hours or a few weeks of his death. It is very important. [Cries of "Oh."]

*MR. SPEAKER: I think we might leave this poor gentleman alone now.

Killea United Irish League Branch.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting of the United Irish League, Killea (King's County) branch, on Sunday 18th October last, when a man named Stapleton was fined £1 for associating with so-called obnoxious people in the locality, and a labourer was forbidden to work for Mr. Cradock, junior, because the league had condemned Mr. Cradock, senior; and what steps the Government intend to take to stamp out the holding of illegal Courts by the United Irish League.

MR. BIRRELL: My attention has been called to a newspaper report purporting to contain an account of the meeting in question, but the police authorities have no knowledge that Stapleton attended the meeting or that he was fined as stated. Mr. Cradock lives in quite a different neighbourhood, and their appears to be no foundation for the statement that a labourer was forbidden to work for him.

Lacken Moonlight Outrage.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a daring moonlighting outrage was perpetrated on 27th October last at Lacken, in the Kilmihill district, County Clare, when a party of disguised and armed men intimidated a man named Cushen by firing a number of shots outside his dwelling-house; can he state what force of police there is stationed at Kilmihill and Kinlea; and what arrests have been made in connection with the outrage, and what sentences passed.

MR. BIRRELL: As regards this case I have nothing to add to my reply to the Question asked by the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on the 4th instant. There are at present one acting sergeant and and five constables at Kilmihill, and one acting sergeant and six constables at Kinlea.

Crookenden and Casey Estate, Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state why the syndicate owning the Crookenden and Casey estate, County Cavan, have not replied to the Estates Commissioners' offer under Section 6 of 3 Edw. 7; when was the first offer made; and will he say when it is likely that a reply will be received.

MR. BIRRELL: The owners of this estate have accepted the offer made by the Estates Commissioners on 7th July last for its purchase.

Cavan Evicted Tenants.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of the townlands, owners, and area gazetted in County Cavan for compulsory acquisition under The Evicted Tenants Act, 1907; what was the date of gazetting; and when is it expected that these lands will be available for the evicted tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have furnished me with a tabular statement giving the required information which I propose, with the hon. Member's permission, to publish with to-night's Votes.

Firearm Outrages in Ireland.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the constabulary authorities have reason to believe that many outrages, including cases of firing into dwelling-houses, have been committed since January, 1907, without the local police having heard of them; and, if so, to what cause such a condition of affairs is attributed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary is of opinion that it is very rarely that any outrage takes place of which the police do not hear. Cases occur from time to time which are not reported by the persons injured, but they almost invariably come to the knowledge of the police. There is no reason to suppose that the number of such cases has increased since January, 1907.

United Irish League in County Sligo.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the Inspector-General the number of branches of the United Irish League in County Sligo, and the proportion of these that have been active during the past twelve months in passing condemnatory resolutions against persons who hold grazing or evicted farms or against those who have given them assistance.

MR. BIRRELL: So far as the police authorities are aware there are forty-two branches of the United Irish League in County Sligo. The proceedings of these branches are usually conducted indoors, and it is not therefore possible to say how many have been active in passing condemnatory resolutions.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the number of resolutions passed by branches of the League and published in the local newspapers?

MR. BIRRELL: I have kept no records.

MR. JOYCE: How many Orange lodges are there in South Antrim, and what resolutions did they pass?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that.

Threatening Letters to Magistrates.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the Inspector-General whether in several cases during the past two years letters threatening with death or serious outrage have been received by local justices of the peace, the object being to prevent them from attending petty sessions; whether in other cases local justices have been boycotted or intimidated because they adjudicated at petty sessions; and will he state what action has been taken by the Government in such cases.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary is not aware of any case in which threatening letters have been addressed to justices of the peace with a view to deter them from attending petty sessions. One magistrate has been boycotted and hooted on account of his action at petty sessions, and another was hooted on one occasion for the same reason, but on full consideration it was decided that the circumstances were not such as to justify a prosecution in either case.

Alleged Terrorism in Ireland.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain from the constabulary authorities whether the condition of a large number of persons in Ireland who struggle to maintain their freedom and independence is pitiable in the extreme; whether these authorities are of opinion that the ordinary law is powerless to supply a remedy; and what steps, if any, it is proposed to take to restore confidence in the law, and to ameliorate the condition of such persons.

MR. BIRRELL: It would be contrary to practice to state the nature of the Reports furnished by the constabulary authorities for the information of the Government, but I have no reason to believe that the condition of any large number of persons in Ireland is pitiable in the extreme. In every case in which persons are known to be subject to intimidation or unlawful pressure all possible steps are being taken, and will be taken, by the police authorities for their protection.

Drogheda Cattle-Drive.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a cattle-drive, within the last few days, near Drogheda, the tails of a number of cattle were tied together, and that in their endeavours to free themselves portions of the tails of three of the cattle were pulled off; and whether any information is forthcoming as to the perpetrators of this outrage.

The following Question also was on the Paper—

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an outrage was committed near Drogheda on Sunday night, 1st November, last, when four cows were injured by having their tails partially torn off; and what arrests, if any, have been made and what sentences passed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that this occurrence had no connection with cattle-driving. It appears to have been the wanton act of four boys, who are being prosecuted for cruelty to animals. This Answer also applies to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member for East Down.

Elphin Agrarian Dispute.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if any arrests have been made in connection with the recent attack on John J. McGrath, of Curcreigh, Elphin, Roscommon, when he was badly beaten about the head as the result of an agrarian dispute; and can he state the nature of McGrath's injuries, and his present condition, and say what led to the assault.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that this assault was not the result of an agrarian dispute. An arrest has been made and proceedings are pending. It is not desirable to enter into any further particulars while the case is *sub-judice* beyond saying that the injured man was certified to be out of danger on 25th October.

Macroom Explosion.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at an early hour in the morning of 6th November last, an explosion occurred in Main Street, Macroom; whether an attack was made on the business premises of Mr. Jeremiah Cronin; whether any restrictions are imposed regarding the sale of blasting powder, dynamite, and other explosives in Ireland; did a similar occurrence take place at Bealik, near Macroom; and what arrests have been made and what sentences passed.

MR. BIRRELL: Four arrests have been made in connection with the explosion referred to in the first part of the Question. As the matter is *sub judice* it is not desirable in the interests of justice to enter into particulars. The restrictions imposed by the Explosives Acts apply to the United Kingdom as a whole. The police authorities inform me that there was no explosion at Bealik, near Macroom, on the night in question.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Do the police say there was no explosion at Bealik, or that the details have not yet reached them?

MR. BIRRELL: They inform me there was no explosion on the night in question.

Athenry Eviction.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state full particulars of the eviction of a herd near Athenry on 2nd November last; what led to the eviction; did the police make a baton charge; were stones thrown by the crowd; were any persons injured; were any arrests made; and, if so what sentences were passed.

MR. BIRRELL: On the occasion in question a herd in the employment of a small landlord near Athenry was evicted. The eviction was due to the fact that the herd had refused to do his work on account of a dispute between the landlord and his tenants. The warrant for possession was addressed to a special bailiff, who, with his assistants, was protected by a force of sixty police. The house was barricaded, but the herd and his family left without offering any resistance after the door had been forced. When, however, the bailiffs proceeded to drive the herd's stock off the farm they were obstructed by a crowd of 200 to 250 people, who became disorderly and threatening and had ultimately to be dispersed by a baton charge. The police saw no stones thrown, and they are not aware that any persons were injured. No arrests were made.

Ballybricken Fair Disturbance.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named Nicholas Quinlan assaulted David Heylin, of the firm of Fitzgerald Brothers, at Ballybricken Fair, Waterford, on 26th October last, by striking him on the head with an ash plant, and subsequently after having his wound dressed, Heylin was again brutally assaulted by Maurice Quinlan and his two sons, Patrick and Nicholas, in the presence of the police; whether he can say if Heylin has recovered from the effects of the assault; and what arrests have been made, and what sentences passed.

MR. BIRRELL: I understand that civil proceedings are pending in this case. It would be undesirable to enter into particulars while the matter is *sub judice.*

CAPTAIN CRAIG: In cases of that sort where an outrage is observed by the police, are they not permitted to take action immediately for assaults committed?

MR. BIRRELL: The police have the fullest powers to take what steps they think necessary in the interests of the repression of violence.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Why have they not done so in this case?

MR. BIRRELL: They exercised their discretion.

Kenmare Sub-Land Commission Court.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of applications to fix fair rents which were heard at the sitting of the Sub-Land Commission at Kenmare in July last; whether Mr. Humphreys, the Assistant Commissioner, visited Kenmare during the first week of October last and left again after two days; the number of holdings he inspected during that period and the number yet to be inspected; why he was recalled from Kenmare, though he had sent through the post notification that he would inspect certain holdings; and whether the Irish Land Commission will communicate the order of the Court to the tenants whose holdings Mr. Humphreys inspected, and, if so, on what date.

MR. BIRRELL: Sixty-seven applications to fix fair rents were heard at the end of July last by the Commission, of which Mr. Humphreys was the lay member. The inspection of the holdings was commenced by Mr. Humphreys on 13th October; but, owing to an accident to his leg, he was almost immediately obliged to postpone the inspection to a later date. He resumed the work towards the end of October, and the decisions in these cases will be announced as soon as possible.

Clare Evicted Tenants.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many evicted tenants have been provided with holdings up to date in County Clare; how many cases are under consideration in the same county; and whether anything will be done to hasten on this work.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that ninety-eight evicted tenants in County Clare have been reinstated in their former holdings or provided with other holdings; forty-nine other applicants have been noted as suitable, and will be provided with farms as soon as practicable; and 113 other applications await consideration.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly impress on the Estates Commissioners the fact that the general peace depends in great measure on the settlement of this question, for which we have waited so long?

[No Answer was returned.]

Limerick Borough Finance.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any information has been submitted to him showing that the borrowing powers of the Limerick County Borough Council have not been substantially exhausted; and will he inquire whether there is a margin of more than £40,000 still remaining before those powers would be exhausted.

MR. BIRRELL: I informed the hon. Member on 5th instant that the borrowing powers of the Limerick Council had been substantially exhausted. I have since made inquiries, and learn that there is an unexhausted margin of some £40,000 in the borrowing powers of the city. But in the case of the loan for a technical school, which was the subject of the hon. Member's Question, the only security which could be accepted consisted of rates amounting to 2d. in the £ which had hitherto been deemed insufficient for the purpose. As I have already stated I am taking what steps I can to secure that the difficulty may be overcome.

Sherlock Estate, Araglen, Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have had the holding, formerly occupied by Mr. David Riordan, on the Sherlock estate, Araglen, County Cork, inspected, with the view to estimating a price to be offered for it, in order to effect the reinstatement of the evicted tenant.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not yet had an inspection made of the holding in this case, but it is under consideration.

Leader Estate, County Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have under consideration the application of Mrs. Alice Nagle for reinstatement in her old holding at Ballinahallisk, on the Leader estate, County Cork; and whether, seeing that the present occupier of her farm, Thomas Nagle, only took possession in 1902, and is not a judicial tenant, the Commissioners will favourably entertain Mrs. Nagle's claim when the sale and purchase of the estate as a whole comes before them.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that Mrs. Nagle's application has been received and will be considered when the Commissioners are dealing with the Leader estate under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Irish Intermediate Education Rules.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland a Question of which I have given him private notice. I had intended to move before putting the Question that the rule of the Intermediate Board should be disallowed, but I believe it is impossible to do that. I beg to ask the Chief Secretary whether the effect of the revised rules issued by the Commissioners of Intermediate Education in Ireland will be to make it impossible after 1909 for anyone who has passed in any grade to present himself again for examination in that grade.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not urgent. It can be put on the Paper in the ordinary course.

MR. KETTLE: I respectfully submit that it is urgent. The rule has just been laid on the Table.

*MR. SPEAKER: That means that it is not urgent, but that there is plenty of time. If the hon. Member puts a Question down to-night he will get an Answer on Monday.

MR. BOLAND: May I point out that there are a number of allotted days, and it may not be possible to raise a discussion on this rule after eleven o'clock. The forty days may run out without any opportunity for the discussion being afforded owing to the number of allotted days or suspension of the Eleven o'clock Rule.

*MR. SPEAKER: It will not be possible to have a discussion, whether there are allotted days or not unless the hon. Member obtains the assent of the Government to it making it practically a Government Order. The Order of the House is that I must adjourn the House when the Orders of the day have been run through.

New Licences.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is now in a position to state whether the Government will take steps to secure that, in regard to all new licences, the holders shall enjoy complete freedom of contract in the purchase of their liquors.

MR. ASQUITH: The Government, as my hon. friend knows, are in sympathy with what they believe to be his main object in this matter, and they are considering whether it will be possible on the Report stage to accept or introduce some provision which will neither be too wide nor ineffectual for the purpose.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: May I ask whether the Government will include the holders of old as well as new licences?

MR. ASQUITH: That will be considered.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I make an appeal to the Prime Minister that, if there is to be another Amendment on Report, due notice may be given?

MR. ASQUITH: Ample notice will be given.

Standard of Naval Strength.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government accepts the two-Power standard of Naval strength as meaning a preponderance of 10 per cent. over the combined strengths, in capital ships, of the two next strongest Powers; and, if not, could he state the definition of the two-Power standard which is accepted by the Government.

MR. ASQUITH: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative.

Agricultural Instruction in Elementary Schools.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will set up the Committee to pass the money Resolution, in order to enable the Grand Committee to proceed with the consideration of the Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill.

I beg also to ask the Prime Minister if he will give facilities for the adjourned debate on the Small Holdings Bill to amend the Small Holdings Act, 1892.

MR. ASQUITH: At this stage of an Autumn Session, the Government cannot even consider the granting of facilities to any Private Member's Bill unless definite assurances are given that the Bill will pass through its further stages after eleven o'clock as a non-controversial measure.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Bill passed its Second Reading without a division? The Committee asked for will take very little time.

MR. ASQUITH: If the Bill is really non-controversial, of course we will consider it, but I have indications from other quarters that it is not regarded as within the category.

The Education Bill.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Government will place upon the Paper the Amendments to the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill agreed upon with the Archbishop of Canterbury; and when the Committee stage of the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill will be entered upon.

MR. ASQUITH: In the event of such an agreement as my hon. friend assumes being arrived at, the Government will put down their Amendments in ample time for their being considered before the Committee stage of the Bill is taken. At the earliest this cannot be before Tuesday the 24th.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, in view of the fact that the Education Bill for England stands next to the Port of London Bill on the Orders of the Day, he can give the House any information whether the statement made by the President of the Board of Education to a meeting of certain Members of this House announced any change in the intentions of His Majesty's Government with respect to that measure; and, if so, will he now say what that change is.

MR. ASQUITH: The statement referred to was made privately by my right hon. friend to a body of his supporters in this House. Any change which the Government propose in the Bill will appear in due course in the shape of Amendments on the notice Paper.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: How soon will notice of those Amendments be given?

MR. ASQUITH: I have used the word "ample." I will endeavour to make the word good.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite appreciate the impossibility of fixing an exact date; but in view of the fact that the suggested alterations of the Bill, whichever rumour is taken, are so great as really to constitute it a new Bill, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he will interpret the word "ample" in a generous sense so as to give the House some opportunity of weighing and forming an opinion upon the merits and demerits of the new proposals?

MR. ASQUITH: Without accepting the right hon. Gentleman's assumption that the Bill is reconstituted, I will interpret the word generously in as wide a sense as I think the necessities of the case allow.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In view of the late sitting last night may I appeal to the Leader of the House not to have a very late sitting to-night. The Bill under discussion is one in which there is great interest, and I am informed that last night the debate was mainly carried on by hon. Members on the Government side. There is, of course, no question of obstruction, but I hope under the circumstances there will not be a very late sitting.

MR. ASQUITH: This, as the right hon. Gentleman indicates, is not a party Bill, and I had hoped we might get through it in reasonable time. Of course no undue pressure will be put on the House.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning etc., Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Attorney-General.

Report to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [LORDS].

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS].

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [LORDS].

Report from the Joint Committee in respect of the Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], pending in the Lords, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 322.]

ADJOURNMENT.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the important difference between the statement of the Prime Minister regarding the future administration of the Unemployed Workmen Act and the Order issued this day by the Local Government Board;" and the pleasure of the House being signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter-past Eight this evening.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (PORT OF LONDON BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Port of London Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House):"—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

The House divided. Ayes, 228; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 375.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barnes, G. N.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.

Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.

Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon)
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.

Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,Sir Charles Edw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Wardle, George J.
Wason, RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Cap.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birminghm
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S
Craig, CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur

Forster, Henry William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R.(Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hill, Sir Clement
Jowett, F. W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)

Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Radford, G. H.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Watt, Henry A.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Vscount Valentia."

PORT OF LONDON (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee:—

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said perhaps it would be convenient to the House if he stated with regard to the first Amendment in his name that while expressing his obligation to the right hon. Gentleman for the way in which he had treated this Bill and put this clause first, he refrained from moving his Amendment. His hon. friends whose names were on the Paper had kindly agreed to allow him to move the second Amendment which stood in his name.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no second Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. LOUGH, in opposing the clause, said he thought everyone would feel and recognise the consideration which had been extended to them in connection with this Bill, but everyone would also feel that this was a clause which required careful attention, because it was of a most extraordinary description. In his Parliamentary experience he had never seen anything like it. There was a transference of property arranged under it, and the price of that property was stated in it. If any Member of the Committee would add up the amounts he would see that they came to something like £23 000,000. He thought it was an innovation in Parliamentary practice that the price should be fixed in the way it was done in the Bill. He believed the clause to be a very difficult one to grapple with, and he asked the indulgence of the Committee in trying to bring the seriousness of the situation before them. The first reason which they might give for asking that the clause be omitted was the way in which the matter had been brought before Parliament. On the First Reading of the Bill no discussion whatever was allowed. The Bill was introduced under the ten minutes rule, and although that was a very useful practice generally, yet, when he considered that the measure contained as one of its main provisions a clause of this kind, he thought it was a great misfortune that no discussion was allowed. If discussion had been permitted, the clause would have secured an amount of attention which it had not had up to the present time. On the Second Reading it was not quite as bad, but they had altogether a very stinted debate on that stage of the measure. The debate only lasted four hours, and it ranged over such a vast number of subjects that it was quite impossible to direct that close attention to the important principle embodied in this clause which it deserved. What was said on the Second Reading debate? It was said that the whole thing would be discussed in Committee. But when the Bill got into Committee there was a most extraordinary ruling given on this point.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I must remind the right hon. Gentleman that whilst he is in order in reviewing the findings of the Committee, he will not be in order in criticising their proceedings.

MR. LOUGH: May I not say that the question of the principle of purchase embodied in this clause was ruled out by the Chairman?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman can of course state that as a fact. What I mean is that he is not entitled to criticise the action of the Chairman.

MR. LOUGH said that nothing was further from his mind. He left the action of the Chairman to the judgment of the House. He would accept the spirit of the Chairman's ruling. He only wished to point the attention of the Committee to the fact that when this question went upstairs to be considered it was immediately ruled out. They had the principles of the Bill stated in an admirable speech delivered by his hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade—perhaps the most explanatory and useful speech they had had on this Bill. His hon. friend, on the Second Reading, stated that the first principle was the establishment of a port authority; the second principle was that it should be a commercial body; and the third principle was that no charge would fall on the rates. His hon. friend also stated that no permanent charge would rest upon trade. These were the three principles of the Bill laid down in the House. Therefore, he thought it was a little unfortunate that, upstairs, this other question in Clause 3 was ruled out of the discussion. What was the result? In all the preliminary stages that the Bill has gone through, the main principle that resided in this clause had never been fully examined. That was the reason why he thought they were indebted to the Government for giving them this opportunity of justifying their appeal to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to extend such consideration to their arguments as would lead him to make some large proposal with regard to the measure — for instance, that Clause 3 be left out; and also lead him to consider the point that this was the first time that this important issue had been raised in a proper way before Parliament. He left that point with the observation that the Government ought to hesitate before pushing through this purchase, which had not received sufficient consideration. The feeling of London was growing stronger against it every day. That was wholly the fault of the Government. The Government did not set the public to think of this problem as they could have done by a discussion in Parliament, and the result was that when the question was becoming important, and when it was known that it would be discussed in that House, public opinion was growing more hostile to the proposal every day. If the Government attempted to make a purchase like that now proposed they must follow what he might call the recognised lines in dealing with this property. They must deal with the matter as business men. A great mistake had run through many of their debates on this subject. The analogy of the Water Board had been dragged into this business. There was no analogy. He maintained there was no analogy between the position which the water companies occupied and the position which these dockowners occupied. The Water Companies had statutory rights within their areas, and nobody could get water save from those companies. Therefore the claim which they might make in arbitration was of an entirely different character from that which dock owners might make. The dock owners were simply rival traders in London, with a valuable business, an historic business if they liked, a business which did not differ in principle one bit from that which was carried on by individuals and companies in this great centre of commerce. Therefore, they must get rid of analogies derived from buying up monopolies. These docks were not monopolies. In ancient days, all through the history of these docks, Parliament had taken care that they should have no monopoly, and that they should be simply trading bodies paid, like a workman, wages for the work they did. He did not think the truth of that statement would be disputed, and he hoped it would be borne in mind all through their discussions. What position were the Government in when they came to purchase? They were just in the position of business men when they came to purchase a business or property. What was the business they asked to look at? No doubt it was an old-established business with a large property, and considerable revenue; it was a fluctuating revenue, and rather a declining revenue. Now, what steps should the Government take in dealing with the matter? The steps they should take were quite clearly marked out. They were to separate the freehold property from the fluctuating income of the companies as traders; and the freehold property could be quite easily dealt with. They could get a valuation of it—nowhere better than in the City of London. They could pay the price fixed by this valuation for the property, and then they could deal with the income in accordance with recognised principles. That was the method of procedure which the Government were almost bound to adopt. He would first look at it from the standpoint that the Government was bound to get a valuation. That was a point which he would like to impress upon the Committee in dealing with his Amendment to leave out this clause. The Parliamentary Secretary, in that splendid speech to which he had already alluded, made the clearest statement with regard to the valuation. He stated that they asked that their valuers should be permitted to report on the various properties—on the land and things of that kind which it would be necessary to calculate in the purchase; and he then proceeded to add that the London and India Docks had 750 acres of land. The Parliamentary Secretary went on to use words which required a good deal of explanation; for he said that the Government had the advantage of the services of Mr. Cruttwell, a member of the firm of Wolfe, Barry and Co., and of Mr. Bousfield, a member of the firm of Edwin Fox and Bousfield, and that the Government were quite ready to justify before the Committee every penny that they were going to ask the House to agree to pay. He must not be understood as putting too heavy a responsibility on his hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade; no one would be more reluctant to do that than he. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also declared that what the Government did was to get the very best men available to value the property. They took the best advice, and on that basis they made their offer. When the matter went up to the Committee the Government put Mr. Cruttwell into the box, and he was asked whether he had made a valuation of the property. He replied that he had not, and that he had not been asked to do so. He was asked what state of repair the docks were in, and what sort of work they had been carrying on; did he think them suitable for the needs of this port, and had he measured how much water there was in the docks. He said he had done none of these things, and he had not been asked to value the docks at all. Mr. Bousfield was not put into the box at all, and Messrs. Edwin Fox and Bousfield had good reason to complain of the use made by the Government of their name in the matter. When the Committee asked where the valuation was, Mr. Plender gave the reply that no valuation had been made, and they did not think it necessary. There was an extraordinary conflict of evidence. The Second Reading was procured by a declaration on behalf of the Government that they had obtained the services of valuers, and the names of the men were given, and when they went before the Committee it was said that no valuation whatever had been made and the Government did not think it necessary. That was a most extraordinary proceeding in a large purchase of this kind and one which no business man would have sanctioned. He wanted to allude to one point only which was brought before them, both by the Parliamentary Secretary and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as a matter of great and substantial value in these properties, the purchase of which Parliament was asked to approve. The Parliamentary Secretary said that certain of the docks had a large quantity of land—750 acres. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer said those lands were of immense value, and he was quite certain they were worth over a million of money. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman how was he certain they were worth over a million of money. How had he any knowlege of the value of these lands? Then Mr. Plender, who appeared to be the only professional man who was really taken into confidence, referred to the matter and stated that lands of great value belonged to the companies. The attention of the hon. Member for Central Hackney, who was a member of the Committee, was called to this, and he said—and he did a great service by putting the question—"Are these 750 acres of land valued?" "Certainly," said Mr. Plender, "they were valued by Mr. Bousfield of Edwin Fox & Bousfield, at £3,600 an acre." His hon. friend was astonished, and he asked "Are you sure these were the vacant lands?" "Yes," said Mr. Plender, "these were the vacant lands." If that statement had proved to be accurate that would represent a value of £3,000,000 sterling, but the Government, fortunately for themselves, had a very careful man in the Committee, named Mr. Fitzgerald, K.C., looking after their interests. Mr. Fitzgerald created quite a sensation in the Committee by saying a mistake had been made. The lands that were worth £3,600 an acre were not the 750 acres at all. No valuation was ever made of the 750 acres except by the directors themselves, and Mr. Bousfield's name was withdrawn altogether, and it was explained that the price of £3,600 an acre applied to 200 or 300 acres of land on which the docks themselves were built, which had been purchased sixty years ago at £200 an acre and now were worth this vast sum. These amateur valuers and buyers, in the only case in which they brought before the House a matter of substantial value, had made an essential mistake. These vacant lands had not the great value which the Chancellor of the Exchequer attributed to them. They lay, some of them at Tilbury and others at Crossness. They were scattered over Kent and Essex and they had no proof that any great value attached to them. The matter was of no great importance, except in this way. It showed that single items of value which the right hon. Gentleman and his colleague mentioned as important might be considered as quite illusory. He might almost say the Government were a little like those company promoters who, speaking of a mining claim in some remote country, said there would be found gold, and after the money was subscribed and the enterprise pushed on people began to ask where the gold was, and then they found the prospect very different from what they were led to expect from the glowing accounts given to them. The reason this was important was that it was the only information of a detailed character that they had got. If a man of that House was only buying a bungalow, he would ask some valuer to value it. He would ask for a description of the property. He would have looked at it and seen what it was, and he would have seen that he got something in return for what he was paying. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made an interesting speech, and he used these words—

> "I think the docks suffer very largely in comparison with the docks of the Continent. I was surprised at some of the primitive methods of discharging, and the wheel-barrow business that is going on. In the short visit I paid to the Continent I never saw anything to compare with it. Of course, the Port of London suffers under a disadvantage in comparison with the docks of the Continent. They started after new ideas with regard to machinery, and more especially new ideas with regard to railways, came in. These docks were started when we had hardly any railways here. They were constructed for cart business. Here the trade of the port is in the hands of one, or it may be two, railways, which are not trunk lines but little bits of local lines. Go to Antwerp. What do you find there? Your ship alongside the port, the railway track right by the ship. What have you got here? You have one little local line only."

And words like these had led up to the purchase, at a price sufficient to be the National Debt of the Kingdom, of that property. Surely one would think from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's words that he was going to conclude by saying: "The properties are totally unsuitable for our purpose." He could not throw very much light on the properties. He only told hon. Members that if they wanted to see them to advantage, if they went to that very noble entrance that was made to the Tower Bridge in the East End of London, and if they looked on the right they would see the Tower of London, a splendid specimen of Norman architecture, a beautiful relic of antiquity, while if they looked on the left they would see these buildings which were called the docks. They would see a lofty wall springing up from the ground. If they went in very close they would see a number of houses like prisons with iron-barred windows, and in the centre of a huge collection of buildings of this kind they would find a pool of muddy water. These were the docks that they were paying this immense price for. He heard that many of the gates would not open, and that if they were open no ship could get in, that in many of the docks the entrance was only 40 feet wide, and to be of any use they wanted an entrance of 100 feet. Some of the locks were only 150 feet long, and if they were to be useful they ought to be 700 feet long. The depth of water had never been told them. He heard some were half full of mud. How many warehouses had they? Were they used? What was the value of them? No information whatever had been given on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman smiled. He hoped he would smile when he had finished. The truth was that these early Victorian or Georgian docks were built in days when this country had a tariff. That was the meaning of the barred gates and the huge warehouses. For a free trade country many of these docks were absolutely and totally useless. The Government should have laid before the House a description of the property. They should have stated the valuers' opinion on which they had gone and then they could have proceeded in a sane and business-like manner with regard to this transaction. Let him just say one word on another branch of the subject. The Government had, with that great art which resided especially in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, created an immense feeling in favour of this Bill. That feeling rested on a very questionable foundation. It could not be an intelligent feeling. They did not know what the thing was that was to be bought. This bargain as it stood now had no more authority than if it had been made between two fish women in Billingsgate. The House of Commons had to give validity to the bargain, and if this Committee said the proceeding was questionable and held up its hands it must stop. The Board of Trade had no right to proceed in this way unless the House approved. The whole business rested with Parliament, and no Member ought to give his sanction to this matter, if he was going to preserve the ancient rights of the House with regard to the handling of financial matters, without being thoroughly satisfied that it rested on a sound and business-like footing. He was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer agreed with that statement. He had described what the Government did not do. He would now take the point of what they did do. They bought on income—on revenue. That was a perfectly customary proceeding and whenever a very doubtful business was to be sold it was always sold on income or revenue. Two methods were always uniformly adopted when the sale was based on income. The first was to select an artificial period for the income, which did not give a fair description of the business, and in the artificial period some doubtful procedure was carried on to inflate the income. There were two things which always distinguished properties when they were sold on income. This purchase by the Government was a most astounding illustration of these two propositions. The Government had bought upon a period of six years, from 1902 to 1907, and they took the revenue for those six years. They said they would give a price which left a very small margin based on that income. The figures for the period of six years had been deliberately inflated for the purpose of the sale of the docks. There was an inquiry by the Royal Commission upon which the right hon. Gentleman opposite was a very useful member. That Commission inquired into this question of income, and the chairman of the docks, Mr. Scott, was one of the witnesses called before them. He complained that business was bad and that the income was not sufficient. That was in 1901. Mr. Scott was asked to what he attributed the bad business and the Commission pointed out to him that his company was not charging the full dues on ships. Mr. Scott replied: "Yes, I know, we have a statutory maximum of 1s. 6d. per ton, but we are only charging one shilling." The Committee said to him: "But why do you not charge 1s. 6d. per ton?" Mr. Scott replied: "We are loth to charge the full price lest it should drive away shipping from our docks. The port is already a very dear port, and if we raise the price I am afraid it might not be good for our business." He thought that was a good answer, but the curious thing about it was that it was made in 1901, and the experiment which the chairman deprecated was made immediately after the answer was given; the result of that experiment was before the eyes of the Government and yet it did not warn them about proceeding to purchase those docks on income. In 1902, although the chairman of the docks made this statement, a charge of 1s. 6d. was levied as dues on shipping instead of 1s., and the Royal Commission in its Report on that point deprecated the action of the docks which it described as a questionable experiment. He must trouble the Committee with figures for the two periods. He would first tell hon. Members how the income was proceeding during the three years previous to 1901 before the maximum charge was levied. He would quote his figures in round numbers. In 1899 the revenue was £661,000; in 1900, £676,000; and in 1901, £733,000. Those figures showed a progressive income. Although the company was paying a very trifling dividend, he wished specially to call attention to the fact that the income was progressive.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): That was the time of the war.

MR. LOUGH said that was so, but there had been better times since. In January the charges were raised 50 per cent. He knew it was always very simple in business to suddenly put up prices by 50 per cent., but every business man knew that that was a terible risk to run, and they might find that they were doing worse after raising the price than they were doing before. What took place? Immediately the revenue sprang up to £873,000, then it dropped to £813,000 for the next year, and then to £732,000, and at the end of four years the 1s. 6d. dues on ships had failed to produce as much revenue as the 1s. produced in 1901. That was a most remarkable figure, and it was almost inconceivable to men who were not accustomed to business. If he might be allowed to mention it, they had had an example of the same kind in this House. They once had a Chancellor of the Exchequer who was hardly driven, who thought it would be a very easy way of raising revenue to charge a 2d. stamp duty on cheques instead of 1d. As hon. Members knew, the House convinced the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a fortnight that he would not get half the income he was receiving with the 2d. stamp duty as he was actually receiving with the 1d. duty. The moment they raised a charge for any service over the legitimate amount they did not get a larger but a smaller sum. He had shown that after four years of the higher charges the dock companies were receiving a smaller amount than when they only charged 1s. per ton. In the fifth year the revenue was £749,000; in the sixth year, £763,000. Therefore, the Committee would see that the amount realised in 1907 with a 1s. 6d. charge was not nearly so great as they would have got if they had stuck to their 1s. charge all through. The period of 1905–6–7 was a period of inflated business, and with all this immense export trade caused by the war this company were raking in no more revenue than they were getting before they raised their charges 50 per cent. What advantage had they got? They had got no advantage at all except that the Government somewhat impetuously accepted those six years, bringing in the first three years for which there was no legitimate basis. They brought those first three years into the general average on which the docks should be bought. He submitted that he had shown that an artificial period was selected which was quite different from the figures which would have been given three years before the price was raised. It was hardly credible that a House of business men would sanction the price which had been given. Nearly thirty years purchase of this fluctuating income was the price which the Government had agreed to pay. They were going to pay the same price for a fluctuating income as for the freehold property. The scheme was based upon twenty-six years purchase of the property and thirty years purchase of the income. That was a monstrous transaction as far as the income was concerned. He did not question the price for the property, but to buy a declining business like this at thirty years' purchase was ridiculous. The proper price was well known, and the Government should have paid about four or five years purchase for the income. One of the best businesses he knew of was Guinness's Brewery, and that business was sold at ten years' purchase of the income. Surely the Government did not suggest that this income of £800,000 a year in connection with these companies was anything like so large a concern to deal with. The profits on Guinness's Brewery were larger than this, and he submitted on those facts that the price agreed upon was a monstrous price, and it was a transaction which all business men in the House should hesitate to sanction. He had told the Committee how he thought they should have gone to work, and he had described how the Government did go to work. He hoped the Committee would bear with him while he went into the results produced by the setting up of this Port authority, and the bargain which had been made. The results were deplorable. The authority was to be created in a new form from that in which any local authority was ever created before, and entirely because of this bargain. Anything like the way the unfortunate Port authority proposed by the Bill would come into existence was absolutely without precedent in this country. The purchase of the docks in the first place had upset the whole finance of the Port authority for ninety years to come. Its finances could never be right because of this first wrong purchase. The purchase price was to be £23,000,000, but the docks were no use as they were, and £5,000,000 must be spent upon them. When that sum had been spent and depreciation had commenced the sum of £1,100,000 a year would have to be paid in interest and depreciation and interest on the purchase price. That heavy burden would be thrown upon the commerce of this fair city for docks which were entirely unsuited to the needs of the trade. All this would have to be done before they commenced what he respectfully suggested was the real work of the Port authority to undertake. This purchase of the docks had led them aside from even contemplating the great problem which the Port of London presented. What was the Port of London? It was that noble stretch of river from London Bridge to the Nore which for all ages had been one of the greatest highways of ships that the world possesses. It was never frozen in winter, and there were no serious floods to make shipping dangerous. Long before these docks came into existence there was a splendid trade done in the river, and the essential thing the Committee should keep before it was that the river should be made to be in the future what it has been in the past, a great highway for ships suited to the commerce of this great city. This meant that they had to keep a depth of 30 feet of water from London Bridge to the Nore.

Mr. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): You cannot do it.

Mr. LOUGH said they would have to make the water as deep as they could in order to let the large ships up the river. Were they going to see the trade of London, which had existed for thousands of years, snatched away by Southampton and Harwich and possibly by Continental ports? It would be a crime for the House to do that. Arrangements would have to be made for deepening the river at whatever cost, so that the commerce of London might have every due facility. That point had been entirely left out in the Government plan. They were going to buy shallow docks at the mouth of the river before providing the necessary outlay for deepening the river and making it a great highway. As regarded finance, the proposal was entirely spoiled by this plunge into the tremendous outlay provided in Clause 3. He was not going to repeat the excellent observations made upon the Second Reading by the hon. Member for North St. Pancras on this point. The hon. Member went into another aspect of the financial question, and he showed that owing to this purchase clause they would have to raise the money very dearly. The port stock would not be a trust security, and if that point alone were met by making it a trust security a saving of £100,000 a year would be effected. His hon. friend also pointed out that the stock of these docks had been greatly inflated and that £1,000,000 had been added to the dock securities. All this had taken place and more would take place if this clause was sanctioned. He thought he had said enough to show that the financial obligations which this part of the Bill would lay upon London in the future were far too great to allow the House to hurry along with this clause. The dignity of the authority was greatly lowered by the arrangement which the Board of Trade had seen fit to make in order that the purchase price might be paid. Anyone who looked at the Bill would find some extraordinary proposals. This poor Port authority would be over-ridden by the Board of Trade to the day of its death, and if it ventured to dismiss an office-boy he could appeal to the Board of Trade and get a special inquiry into his case, and the Board of Trade might order the Port authority to restore the emoluments to this naughty boy. If the holders of stock did not get their interest paid at the right time they, too, could go to the Board of Trade, and they could get a receiver's order. The Board of Trade were bringing into existence in the City of London a body of this kind which would be dependent to the day of its death upon the Board of Trade. The dignity of the body had been sacrificed. There was no need to put provisions as to purchase into the Bill at all. What they wanted to do—and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to consider this—was to construct a Port authority. That was their proper business. He would say: "Let the Port authority first come into existence. Let it begin to deepen the river and look at the docks." They could then negotiate with the dock companies to buy them on a business basis. Let them do so, and if they could arrange for a purchase they could come to the House to get power to acquire particular docks. There was no need for proceeding in the rapid way for which the Bill provided. He would make another suggestion which he thought the right hon. Gentleman should consider, namely, the relations of the Port authority to the municipality. He would like to see the representation of the County Council increased. He would like to see a bargain made with the Council on the basis of increased representation on the Port authority on the one hand, and of the County Council giving the guarantees of the rates for the stock on the other. Then it would be a trust security, and there would be a saving in the raising of money. He would, in short, give to the County Council all the powers to protect itself which the Board of Trade was giving to the Port authority. He believed there was only one objection to that course, and that was that the present London County Council did not wish to take on the responsibility of guaranteeing the stock. The late County Council did not want to take the responsibility of guaranteeing the stock of the Water Board, but Parliament threw upon it the responsibility. He thought this Parliament ought to take the responsibility of imposing a similar obligation with respect to the Port authority. He did not think the County Council had been approached in the spirit of his suggestion. It had been approached by the Board of Trade, but not from the point of view of giving the County Council such representation as would enable it to protect the rates. He put that before the Committee to show that he was not barren of suggestion in the matter. He thought the matter was extremely urgent. He took the action he was taking with the greatest regret. He was so busy with other things that he would have been glad not to deal with this matter at all. It was only six years since in the autumn session of 1902 he and seven other Members on 9th or 10th December fought against the proposition to create the Water Board, but they were swept away in consequence of one of those arrangements which were constantly made between the two front benches. They fought it out to the end, and he remembered almost the words he used in his concluding remarks on that occasion. He said that he hoped London consumers would not regret the step the House was taking, but that he believed they were bringing into existence an extravagant body which would lay heavy burdens on London. What was going on to-day? It was the most marvellous thing of which they had had experience in politics. He believed that in the Bank of England there was a man going about with a divining rod to see if a place could be found to sink a well because the Bank of England was not rich enough to pay the rates. Now he heard that stormy meetings presided over by the Lord Mayor were being held in the Guildhall to protest against the enormous burden this body was imposing on London. He appealed to the Government and to the Committee to have some mercy on London and not to inflict on the population another extravagant body which would be worse than the Water Board or any other board created up to the present. The Board of Trade was not going to pay this money itself. The Government did not propose to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer power to pay for the undertakings. They were going to make a bargain and make another man pay the money. On behalf of the Port authority yet unborn, and which when brought into being would have a troubled existence, he appealed to the Committee to reject the clause.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport): My right hon. friend has given in very eloquent but over-coloured language an interesting description of the properties we are proposing to acquire under the Bill. He has told us that anybody who likes to go there and inspect them will find that many of the warehouses have the appearance of prisons, that they are unsuitable for the purposes to which they are devoted and that they have served for over 100 years. Let me put this point at the commencement. In spite of the criticism which my right hon. friend brings to bear, we are contemplating the purchase by agreement under the Bill of three properties which have a gross revenue of £2,500,000 a year, so that we are not acquiring the worn-out class of undertaking my right hon. friend pretends that we are buying. He says first of all that one of his objections to this clause is that suitable opportunities have not been afforded to the House for the discussion of the principle of purchase contained in the Bill. He said that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced the Bill under the ten minutes rule, and that on the occasion of the Second Reading, which I had the honour to move, only four hours were occupied in the discussion of the principle. He said that the debate was closured, and that the facilities afforded for ventilating opinion on the points which he brings up now were altogether lacking. But he did not stop his criticism there. He carried it to the Joint Committee, which investigated the matter for twenty-one days. That Committee consisted of some of the best intellects we have in this House and in the other House, and they gave every provision in the Bill most exhaustive examination. The principle of purchase had been affirmed here on the Motion for the Second Reading. I would remind my right hon. friend that that principle was unanimously recommended by the Royal Commission in 1902. That it was the main feature of the Bill of the late Government which was brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour in 1903. The principle of purchase was reaffirmed by the Joint Committee of that year. It is the principle of our Bill, and I myself put it definitely to the House. I took the liberty of using the exact words which were used by Mr. Gerald Balfour in 1903 when I put it to the House that by accepting the Second Reading we would be committing ourselves to the principle of purchase. My right hon. friend says that the Committee did not consider the principle of purchase. They examined it in the most exhaustive way, they had witnesses day by day from 24th June to 8th July, and the details of purchase were considered from every point of view, and what is satisfactory to the Government is that the Committee accepted the principle of purchase on the terms proposed by the Government on the Second Reading.

MR. LOUGH: Were valuators' reports read before the Committee?

*SIR H. KEARLEY: I will have a word to say about that in a moment. That is not the point I was endeavouring to make good, in response to my right hon. friend's contention that we had not considered the principle of purchase. My right hon. friend complains that the Board of Trade in calling in two experts to advise them as to the method by which we should proceed in endeavouring to arrive at the basis on which purchase should take place, did not follow recognised lines. He laid down a programme of procedure for us, and I venture to say that if it was adopted or attempted to be adopted, we would be regarded as men insane or nearly so. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the purchase of the great brewery business of Guinness, and said that we should have gone on a basis of four or five years' profits. Let us look at the figures. It requires very little mental calculation to show how that would have worked out. The capital of these three undertakings was somewhere about £24,000,000. The exact figure is £23,750,000. If you take the basis of purchase at four or five years' profits, what would be the amount which would have to be given in consideration of the purchase of these vast undertakings? If you take the average profits at £800,000 a year, that would be, if we had proceeded on the lines suggested by my right hon. friend, £4,000,000 for the £24,000,000 of capital.

MR. LOUGH: The hon. Gentleman is not at all representing what I said. It is really not fair to put it in that way. What I stated was that the purchase of Guinness' business was based on a ten years' purchase of profits, and that I thought that would be an extremely outside figure.

*SIR H. KEARLEY: I can quite understand that my right hon. friend has forgotten some of the observations he made in his speech as to the method which ought to be adopted in regard to purchase. He said that we should have purchased on the basis of four or five years profits, and he suggested that we should have swept on one side the whole of the freehold property of the dock companies. I suppose he meant to convey that we should have left the dock companies in possession of their freehold property.

MR. LOUGH: I appeal to the recollection of the Committee. What I said on the question of freehold property was that the full price which any recognised valuer stated it was worth should be paid and that when the freehold property which might be very valuable was acquired the goodwill of the business should have been bought at so many years purchase.

*SIR H. KEARLEY: I quite understand my right hon. friend's contention that if we had proceeded on his basis we should have purchased at a very much lower price than we shall have to pay. It is ridiculous to ask the House to affirm the principle of purchase at this stage, seeing that the principle of purchase has already been accepted by the House on Second Reading and justified by the Joint Committee after a full examination of all the details, and I am prepared here and now to justify it before the House of Commons. Let us consider the principle on which we proceeded to make the purchase. There were two courses open to us. We might have proceeded to buy the undertakings by arbitration, or to buy the properties by agreement. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he introduced the Bill at the beginning of the year, gave pretty obvious reasons why we should proceed to purchase by agreement rather than by arbitration. He pointed out that by agreement we should avoid delay and expense, but above all, that we should absolutely avoid the uncertainty as to what the price would be. We should remember that the Bill itself would have to pass through the House of Commons before the arbitration could be entered upon, and that when the Water Bill was before this House the strongest possible objection was made to it on that ground. However, the Water Bill was based on arbitration and the measure was passed through the House without it having any knowledge whatever as to the ultimate price of the undertakings a necessary consequence of buying on arbitration terms. Having this very much in mind we decided not to proceed to purchase by arbitration, but only by agreement. Now, let me say a word in regard to delay. Suppose that we had proceeded to purchase on arbitration terms, there would not have been one arbitration, but there would have been separate arbitrations with regard to the London and India Docks, the Surrey Commercial Dock, and the Millwall Dock, and all that would have taken a long time and would have incurred an enormous amount of expense, every penny of which would have had to be paid by the Port authority, and would have constituted a permanent burden on the trade of the port. I am told by our advisers that there are many other considerations that come into play when purchase is made by arbitration. For example, allowance would have had to be made for surplus lands. If we had proceeded to purchase by arbitration, the arbitrators would have fixed a very high figure on the value of these lands. I am told that if we had proceeded to purchase by arbitration, the arbitrators would have made allowances for the prospects of future profits. None of these things were taken into consideration by our method. And then there would have been large expenses incurred in raising cash to pay off the existing stockholders. It was laid down clearly in the Water Board arbitrations, that where shareholders are being compulsorily expropriated, the option rests with them of saying whether they will take their compensation in cash or in stock. Does not the right hon. Gentleman see that that does not apply here? How did we proceed? We proceeded on an altogether different plan. I think I have shown why it was that we did not proceed to purchase by arbitration, but by agreement. And how did we proceed? My right hon. friend was very critical on this point, and he called in question the methods we adopted. I say that the only possible basis on which purchase by agreement could be made was that adopted by the Government. We first of all called in the services of one of the most eminent accountants in London—Mr. Plender, of the firm of Deloitte, Plender, Griffiths, and Co., which is recognised as one of the best firms in London. And he advised us. He said it would be necessary for me to get an undertaking from the dock companies that I should have the freest possible access to their books; I must have an opportunity of calling in an engineer who will be able to advise as to whether the condition of the properties and the equipment of the works are such that the income earned now can be maintained. That is a very well understood basis in a process of this kind. My right hon. friend in his criticism of this matter showed considerable dexterity. However, we opened negotiations with the dock companies. We put it to them that we did not propose to purchase their undertakings in any other way than by agreement. They met us in the most friendly and generous way. They promised that our accountants should have access to their books and that any examination of their properties we desired might be freely entered upon by our engineer. These two experts between them set to work to arrive at one definite result. And what was it? They set to work to arrive at what is called the net maintainable income of the undertakings. What is meant by "net maintainable income? It is the amount which we are advised, the Port authority will itself enjoy as owner of the combined undertaking. They ascertained what was the net income derived over a period of six years, and they had to calculate whether that net income would be derived in future from the combined undertakings. The investigation of the books alone was not sufficient for that purpose, it was necessary to call in an experienced engineer to ascertain definitely whether the property had been sufficiently maintained so that the undertakings would continue to earn in the future the income they have earned in the past. Mr. Cruttwell, one of the most eminent engineers in London, was our adviser. That gentleman is one of the partners in the firm of Sir John Wolfe-Barry, an engineer of the greatest possible experience. My right hon. friend takes exception to the fact that we did not value these undertakings. He wants us to value the buildings and the dock walls, to measure up the water area, to try underground and see whether the walls are sound or not, and to ascertain what is necessary to be put in these erections. What Mr. Cruttwell set to work to do was to ascertain whether the condition of these undertakings was such as to ensure that they were able to maintain the net available income they were now yielding. That was the procedure he adopted. My right hon. friend says that we selected an artificial period and tried to palm off on the House of Commons what in effect was a fraudulent return. If in these investigations we have selected an artificial period, that means that we entered into this examination not in a straightforward way.

MR. LOUGH: A stupid way.

*SIR H. KEARLEY: What particular interest had we in making these investigations over what my right hon. friend terms an artificial period? He suggests that we took that artificial period as our basis of purchase because that represented an inflated income. We took an honest six years average, the reason for which was fully explained by Mr. Plender before the Committee. The fact is that in 1901 there was an amalgamation between the London and St. Katherine's Docks Company and the East and West India Docks Company. That is generally known. How could we make an investigation further back than the period of the amalgamation of the London and St.

Katherine's Docks Company and the East and West India Docks Company. It is important to note that the capital of the London and India Company as compared with the other companies is £18,000,000, or practically three-fourths of the whole. We found it was possible to take that period and no other. I come now to the purchase itself which I am going to justify by figures. Mr. Plender set to work to ascertain what was the net maintainable income of the undertakings, and taking the average of six years he found that the net income was the sum of £809,000 per annum. What are we giving in exchange for that? We are giving Port Stock yielding a smaller income. And that is what my right hon. friend calls a doubtful bargain! As regards the Surrey Commercial Dock, that company deals with very large importations of timber, and never since 1868 had the importations of timber been so low as during the period mentioned. That circumstance arose from the serious depression in the London building trade. As to the Millwall Docks Company, their trade is largely in timber and in grain, and owing to the disturbances in Russia and the economic conditions prevailing in consequence in that country, the importations of grain were very much below the average. In one year they were half the normal quantity of the six years under review. That again had a detrimental effect on the revenue of these docks. We had, therefore, to consider this extraordinary and abnormal depression in the timber trade and the grain trade.

MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): Are we to understand that the interest paid on the Dock Stock is less than the maintainable income? Are they not almost identical figures?

*SIR H. KEARLEY: My hon. friend wants to know what is the difference between the two. The interest on the Port Stock which we are giving in substitution for the Dock Stock is just under £800,000, so that there is a surplus of £9,000.

MR. W. PEARCE: For all intents and purposes they are the same.

*SIR H. KEARLEY: It is not a large sum, I admit; but still, there are these special circumstances to be taken into consideration, and in the current year the trading gives an encouraging indication that we may hope for very much better results than in the six years period. My right hon. friend has twitted the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the statement which he made when he introduced the Bill, that we secured the surplus land for no consideration whatever, and to which he attributed a large value. The value of this surplus land, amounting to 780 acres, is estimated by the company at as much as £1,650,000. These lands are situated, not as my right hon. friend says, at Crossness and places where they have no value at all, but in the very best positions on the river, and the main portions of them are contiguous to and adjoining the existing undertakings. What does that mean from the point of view of the Port authority in possession? Does it not mean that it can proceed at once with those developments which were held to be so necessary by the Royal Commission, and everybody who has any knowledge of the subject? They will be able to develop those lands at once, without the extraordinary expenditure incidental to the acquisition of land which is so detrimental to the public interest generally. In addition to the land for which we paid not one single penny of consideration—land said to be worth £1,500,000—we shall succeed to the Greenland Dock, a magnificent dock, which is part of the Surrey Commercial undertaking, and a set of new warehouses, specially built to meet the needs of the American and Canadian produce trade, upon which there has been in the last twelve years expended a capital sum of £1,500,000. My right hon. friend made no reference—I thought he was rather ungenerous in not doing so—to what must have been obvious to him, that some of these properties we are taking over are absolutely up-to-date, with the newest possible equipment and machinery. The profits which entered into the six years average and formed the basis of the purchase price only included three years working of this property. I do not know whether it is clear what I am endeavouring to convey, but everybody knows, and it is an admitted fact, that a new dock takes many years to develop its adequate revenue, and by adequate revenue I mean this—a reasonable return on the capital invested. Tilbury Dock, I am informed, took as many as twenty years to develop its adequate revenue. That is a very long period indeed. With regard to this particular Greenland Dock, from the way in which it has been patronised by shipping and its warehouses are being filled by people who trade to and from the United States and Canada, it will, in our judgment, show with great rapidity increasing profits, and we hope to see the full fruition of that great development in the next few years. The point I wish to make is this—that in this average profit of six years, the profits made from this Greenland Dock extension only come in for three years. Therefore, the revenue must be largely increased by the profits of these new docks in the future. I am told by those who know the river that there is great congestion in the trade of the Port. Tilbury is full, with every berth occupied, and the same thing is to be found at the London and India Docks, and the service which will be rendered to the port by this Greenland Dock will be of the greatest possible advantage. It will give at once to the new authority a water area to which large ships will come, and so increase the revenue of the Port authority immediately.

Mr. STEADMAN: In what part of the river will that be situated?

*Sir H. KEARLEY: There is nobody in this House knows the river better than the hon. Gentleman does; and why should he cross-examine me when he knows the position of this dock and that it is doing a large and increasing trade?

Mr. STEADMAN: I thought you were referring to a new dock.

*Sir H. KEARLEY: Now with regard to this question of value—and here I am on sound ground, and this my right hon. friend will be obliged to recognise and admit. Three years ago an agreement was entered into between the London and India Docks Company and the Millwall Company for an amalgamation, which involved the purchase by the London and India Docks Company of the Millwall Dock. The London and India Company under the agreement they entered into agreed to transfer to the Millwall Dock Company an amount of their own stock that would give an annual value of £65,000 a year. That was the agreement that was entered into three years ago. Now what is our agreement? We give to the Millwall Dock substituted "A" and "B" Port stock; that will impose on the Port authority a charge upon the annual income of the Port of £56,000 a year, so that by our agreement made three years later we obtained *much more* advantageous terms. What I have to say in conclusion is this: That we have the fullest possible confidence in the bargain that we have made. We believe that the existing undertakings will earn and continue to earn the interest on the Port stocks that we have given in substitution, and instead of imposing upon the trade of the Port, as was suggested, a charge by reason of the interest obligation, we think that the surplus will grow year by year. We think that it must turn out to be a most favourable transaction, because we cannot lose sight of the fact that in the average of six years that we have taken there have been abnormally bad years brought about by the depression of trade —the corn trade of the Baltic—and the building trade in London—and we think these periods of bad trade were quite exceptional and not likely to recur. For these reasons I say again that we are as confident as we can be, after the fullest possible investigation, that the surplus income will largely increase in future, and I may say that we are confirmed in this belief by every indication that has reached us. Quite recently, with regard to this year's trade I myself took steps to endeavour to ascertain how the trade of these undertakings was proceeding, and as far as my information goes there is a decided indication of improvement which induces us to think that when the balance is struck at the end of the year, instead of the income being on the basis of the figures which I have given as necessary to maintain the income, it will be something much larger, and so give a much bigger surplus than that which I have mentioned earlier in my speech. Are there no savings to be effected by this unification of the management? Does my right hon. friend, who has had a great deal of experience, suggest for a moment that the managerial staff of the three undertakings will not be capable of modification, when it is a unified undertaking with a unified management. And has he such a poor opinion of this new Port authority that he thinks it is not capable of dealing with the business committed to it in such a manner as will do something to improve the condition of the river and the trade of the Port? I am very hopeful myself. We believe that the new Port authority will enter upon its duties with a determination to eliminate all that is bad or doubtful in the port, to use its energies to attract to the port the best class of trade, and by intelligent supervision and good management produce a beneficial effect upon the trade of the Metropolis, which I hope under the agency of this Bill will enter upon a new era of development and prosperity. We believe that this Bill is a necessary and essential step towards securing for London, for all time I hope, that preeminence that she has enjoyed so long as the greatest port in the world.

*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge) said that as Chairman of the Thames Conservancy and having the whole of the conduct of that part of the river near the Port of London under his control, he thought he might give some expressions of opinion that might be valuable to the House. He considered that it was most desirable to have one authority, and he had spoken in favour of that course on the Second Reading of this Bill, but he could not hide from himself that the whole success or failure in the future of the Port of London entirely depended upon the question of the docks, their value, and price. As to value it had ben stated by the last speaker that he considered that they would continue to maintain their present income in the future as they had done in the past. He doubted that very much, and he doubted it on this ground, that they knew that it was almost impossible to make an old dock worth anything. He remembered perfectly well after the North Eastern Railway Company bought the docks at Hull, it was stated by one of the directors of that company in the House that they had given £250,000 for the docks and had spent £250,000 upon them and they were worth less then than they were before they bought them. These docks must be materially altered if they were to be any success whatever. The amount of shipping coming into the Port of London was very different from what it was when those docks were made. The Tilbury Docks and the Millwall Docks to some extent were good up-to-date docks; the other docks were practically worthless. They tried themselves to get the London and West India Docks to lower their sills so as to allow larger ships to go in. The matter was examined into most carefully and it was found that it was utterly impossible without an enormous expenditure to allow those sills to be altered so as to obtain a greater depth for vessels coming in. Even if they could have done so they could not have lowered the sills more than a certain amount because the walls would have fallen in and destroyed the docks. It was better and would be cheaper to fill up these old docks and build new docks lower down the river if it was the intention of the Board to carry out that principle. The Bill took, and took rightly, the power to build wharves on the river. There was a long stretch down the river, miles in length, where wharves could be established; where they could be made with stages so as to allow a ship to discharge her cargo from various parts at one time; and which would allow trains to be brought up so that the cargo could be discharged straight into the trucks. That was the character of future shipping. Everyone wanted London to be up-to-date. Antwerp and other places that were competing with us had all these wharves built in stages on to which cargo from every part of the ship could be discharged at one time. One of the great objections to docks was the time that it took to get in and out. A large amount of time was expended on that. If ships were allowed to come up and discharge at a wharf all that time would be saved. Lately there had been a great number of ships discharging straight into the lighters in the river in order to save time. Though he thought this was a very valuable Bill and wished to help it in every possible way, he thought this question of the purchase of the docks ought to be deferred, and that it ought to be left to the new authority to carry out such arrangements as they found were possible, and which would be more economical. They had heard about the saving on the staff very often. The Committee heard it with regard to the Water Board when it was said that if the staffs of the old companies were amalgamated a considerable sum would be saved. What had occurred? The cost of the Water Board staff was £19,343 5s. 0d. in excess of the cost of the whole of the other staffs. The same extravagance would be engaged in by this Board. The result would be to make London a dear port and to drive away all the trade that came here. More than that, it would take away the work of the riverside population, and do extensive damage to every part of the City. It was entirely a question of getting an income from tonnage charges. The tonnage on goods would be of a very different character from that which was expected. For instance 8,500,000 tons of coal were brought to London by sea. A very small tax, 1d. a ton, taken by the Port authority would result in this coal being taken by the railways instead of by the sea and the river. If this charge was made so heavy that it must be recovered in some shape or form it would drive all the trade out of the river, and the revenue would fall off. And when they talked of there being only a margin of £9,000 between the price to be paid and that they expected to get it was simply absurd. He had never yet heard of a company which was content to take over a business on such terms as that.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): No, no, the right hon. Gentleman has not listened to my hon. friend. He has left out altogether the value of the lands which are valued at £1,500,000.

*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND: The hon. Member said the difference between the two was £9,000.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is the profit and loss account.

*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND: Then tell us what the value is that the land will bring in.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: My hon. friend said the lands would be taken at the value of £1,500,000, and that over and above that the balance was £9,000.

*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND said he knew that, but he had heard that the land down there was such that it could not be let for any other purpose than docks. But supposing it was £10,000 a year, the margin between what they were bound to give and what they might receive was very small. Let them give the authority power to take the docks and the lands and let them buy them at their market value. If the docks companies had not the Government to deal with they would be willing to sell at a much cheaper price than that which they now offered to the Government. He protested against this great burden being put upon the Port of London. It would drive commerce away from this port and make them all sorry that they took this line at the present time.

*MR. RUSSELL REA (Gloucester) said the hon. Member opposite and his right hon. friend behind him appeared to think there was no necessity for the new Port authority to buy up these particular docks; that the dock owners were only one set of traders among other traders; that they had no monopoly; that they were not essential to their needs and that it was quite open to the Port authority to ignore them. But it was necessary to consider this matter a little —a little historically. Nobody who had investigated the matter, neither the Royal Commission, the late Government, nor the present Government had come to any other conclusion than that it would be impossible to create a new port authority which should not become dock owners and which should not be the owner of these docks. The strength of the claim of the docks lay in this. When they were instituted an obligation was put upon them which was called the obligation of "free water." That meant that these companies might buy land at a low price, say £40 an acre, fence it and spend £100,000 per acre upon it, and when they had done that everybody had a right to use the property as their free water. But against this privilege to the public, some compensations were provided for the docks companies, and they had some monopolies which lasted for twenty-one years. These then expired but they still had a natural monopoly created by the protective system which was then in vogue over the whole country. The cumbrous customs regulations gave these docks an absolute monopoly in the import trade. They lost that when Free Trade came in, and from that time to this they had had a struggling existence. They had come to the House of Commons again and again asking that they should either withdraw the privilege of free water or enable them to charge dues on goods. The House had refused to do anything of the kind. The House maintained the right of free water because various interests had been created and refused the docks power to levy dues on goods, because that practically put into private hands the power to tax the imports of this country. These docks were left in a position in which success was impossible, and to have instituted a port authority which could act independently of these docks and build up others would have killed them altogether. They had a claim which had been allowed by the late Government, the Royal Commission, and the present Government, which entitled them to some consideration. Then these negotiations came about. These docks were not taken over but there was a bargain which was submitted to the Committee upstairs. Although the Committee excluded the consideration of the principle that the Port authority should be dockowners they said that these bargains A., B. and C., must be justified before the committee. They were justified and he did not say that the unanimous conclusion of the Committee was that they were extremely good bargains, but they were bargains of such a character that those who disagreed with them hesitated to take the alternative step of exposing the purchase to the risks of arbitration. He thought on the whole the bargain was a fair one. The property had not been purchased at much below its value, and very much above its value had not been given. The principle on which it was valued was a principle well known to all commercial men. The revenue basis was taken, and when his hon. friend talked about giving the capital value that was quite a different principle. It was almost impossible to mix up the two principles and utterly impossible to act on a capital valuation in such a case as this, because the value of a dock was nothing whatever except for the purposes of a dock, and the revenue it made. It was utterly impossible to act upon the valuation of capital in such a case as this, for a dock had no value whatever unless it commanded the trade. The criticism had been made that, if they took the maintainable revenue of the docks on the one side, and on the other side the obligations created under this Act, there was a surplus of only £8,000. The basis on which the calculation was made was one not to make a profit. It was meant to be a valuation so that as nearly as possible there should be no surplus revenue. The endeavour of the President of the Board of Trade was to give the dock companies a fair value, and the revenue had been investigated with that object. The hon. Member for Uxbridge spoke of the old docks as perfectly worthless. His own impression was that if they took the old docks of London, so picturesquely described by his right hon. friend behind him, and purchased them on a revenue basis to-day, they would probably get them very much below their capital value, for the value of this property in the heart of London was not to be estimated by the revenue which they got out of it by the present system of management, although there was now an extremely valuable warehousing business. As to the value of the surplus lands, it was not to be ascertained as the hon. Member for Uxbridge said, by what rent would be obtainable for them. Their value was entirely for one purpose, namely, the dock purpose. They were not brought into use yet, but they were bought for dock purposes and for dock extension.

Mr. LOUGH: That will cost money.

*Mr. RUSSELL REA said it would cost money, and what was the value of that to the dock owner? What would it cost the dock owner if he had to buy these lands when it came to making the extensions which were recommended by the Royal Commission, which were intended by the late Government, and by the present Government who introduced this Bill, which were needed by the port of London, and which were very much overdue. His right hon. friend talked of spending £5,000,000 to put the docks into order. The evidence was that the docks were in sufficiently good order to produce the revenue which had been stated to the Committee, which had been calculated by the most laborious, careful, and accurate investigation by Mr. Plender, who assured the Committee upstairs, and whose assurance was confirmed by Mr. Cruttwell, that the docks were capable of maintaining their present income. He stated that the docks were in sufficiently good order for the class of traffic they had now, and there was not the slightest doubt that there would in the future be the same class of traffic as now. It had been said that the dock companies inflated revenue by various devices with the object of producing a larger figure of maintainable revenue, but if anybody would think of it they would see that there was very little scope for a dock company to do anything of the kind. Anyone could see how various trading companies, and even railway companies, might do it, but dock companies could not do it to any great extent. It was proved to the Committee that they had spent nearly £100,000 per annum on the upkeep of their docks. The conclusions to which he came, and the collective conclusions of the Committee, were: First, that it was the duty, if possible, of a port authority to acquire docks, and to acquire these particular docks. Secondly, that the bargains had not been bad bargains, and that the confirmation of these bargains would be infinitely preferable to throwing upon the new Port Authority the risk of having in the end to take all the chances of which they had had so much experience under arbitration. On the whole, he was a strong supporter of this clause and the next.

Mr. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he had very few remarks to make on this subject. He was really sorry that he could not emulate the enthusiasm of the Secretary to the Board of Trade with regard to this bargain. Everyone who listened to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington, whether they agreed with him or not, must have heard them with enjoyment. The right hon. Gentleman's criticisms seemed to be of that illusive character, that whether they agreed with them or not they must enjoy them. He began by comparing the Government, of which he was so renowned a supporter, with gentlemen in the City who bought a strip of land and floated a gold-mining company, and then looked for gold. That was not the way in which he should be inclined to speak even of his opponents. The right hon. Gentleman was almost picturesque in what he said of a mediæval structure, and something which was like the Bastille—these were the warehouses, the Committee would notice. Having said this much about what fell from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he was bound to repeat that he did not share the enthusiasm of the Secretary to the Board of Trade about his bargain. The hon. gentleman thought he had made an extremely good bargain. That was his idea. The way in which he looked at the question, and what he thought the Committee had got to conside, was this: First, was it necessary to buy the docks? There was considerable difference of opinion about that. The subject had now been carefully considered for a very long time. The Royal Commission which first took it up decided that it was necessary to buy the docks. The late Government, of which he was a member, very carefully considered it also, and they came to the same conclusion, And now the present Government, with the experience which the others had gained, had also come to the conclusion that they could not hope to get control of the river or effect any radical improvement of the port without becoming the owners and controllers of the docks as well. In the face of that experience he was bound to say that he put aside the idea that it was possible to make any progress without attempting to buy the docks out. Having admitted that they had got to buy the docks, the next point was what was the best way to buy them—whether by agreement or arbitration. He thought there was something to be said in favour of arbitration. He was bound to say, and he said it with all respect to hon. Gentlemen opposite, that if the Government of which he was a member had dared to propose to Parliament that they should make this bargain on their responsibility, and that somebody else, as the right hon. Gentleman said, was to provide the money, whatever the merits might have been there was not a man on the other side of the House who would not have opposed them in the strongest possible manner. He was sure of that. He did not know that much importance was to be attached to the fact that the present Government had a much more reasonable Opposition than had the late Government, and he was not at all sure that this was a sufficient ground for condemning the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had conducted his Bill. But he did say that if they were going to depart from all previous practice they should make perfectly certain that by their private bargain they were getting at least as good terms as they would get by arbitration. There ought to be no doubt on that point; he thought everyone would admit that. Was it quite certain that they were getting as good terms? He had the other day a deputation of gentlemen who were opposed to this Bill, and who told him that the docks could have been got £12,000,000 cheaper by arbitration. ["Oh!" and laughter.] Well, he got them out of the room as soon as possible after they had begun with figures so exaggerated. He thought there was not the slightest reason to hope for a great reduction in the price. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington not only did not accept the issue as between private contract and arbitration, but he was satisfied that Gentlemen sitting on that bench had made an extremely bad bargain as it was. He said—"You ought to have gone and valued the undertaking; you ought to have put a value on the fixed freehold property, and then given ten years (or whatever it was) purchase for the business as a going concern." He was bound to say that as a buyer he would like to adopt the right hon. Gentleman's attitude, but there was one little difficulty about it. The seller would not do business with him on those terms. That was the only difficulty. He had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman could get over that, and he was not sure that his friends could not help him. They knew something of the methods employed with regard to the Licensing Bill. He therefore came to this business with the idea that the probability was that they had got a better bargain by agreement than they would get by arbitration. But when the right hon. Gentleman pointed out to them what a splendid bargain it was, he was afraid that he must have a little criticism on that aspect of the subject. The business was quite properly based for this kind of undertaking on its value as a going concern. What he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington had overlooked was this. Supposing it did go to arbitration, the usual and universal rule in an arbitration of this kind was to judge of the value of the property by the length of the maintainable income. There was a difference which was in favour of the Government. In addition to valuing it from the point of view of net maintainable income, the valuers would also have been bound to take into account the prospective value of the unused land. Therefore, so far as the method of arriving at the value was concerned, London and the country did undoubtedly get some advantage by paying only for the net maintainable income, if it was correctly arrived at, and not by having to pay for any value outside that which would have to be paid for in arbitration. The whole point was, was this the net maintainable income? The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade said quite truly that Mr. Plender, the accountant appointed by the Government, was one of the best authorities on that subject who could be found in the City of London. He thought that was quite true. But in reading Mr. Plender's evidence, though he thought perhaps he was right in saying this was the net maintainable income, he was very optimistic about the future, and he thought he had conveyed that optimism to the Board of Trade. For instance, he gave the idea that a much larger income would be available in the future. He said that several times to the Committee. Then Lord Leith he thought it was, said—"On what is that view as to the future based?" Mr. Plender said—"In 1898 there was such and such an amount of trade as shown by the Board of Trade table, done in the Port of London. In 1907 that trade had increased enormously. That means an increased profit to the port in larger shipping dues." He wondered it did not occur to the President of the Board of Trade that there was surely a very great fallacy in that argument. Taking the six years which were given as the basis of the profits the average of the last three years represented £40,000 less income than the average of the first three years. Yet if they took those figures on which the basis for the future was based, they would find there had been an actual increase in the second three years as compared with the first three years, and if that was the ground on which they expected those enormous profits in future, it ought to have applied to that period as well as the other. That was quite obvious. The hon. Gentleman talked about the three bad years. Did he forget the fiscal speeches for the last four years, pointing to those years of much golden trade as taking away all need of fiscal reform? Those years were big years of trade in London as well as the rest of the country. If he had been looking at those figures, simply judging by them as to whether or not this was a good bargain, he would, he was afraid, have drawn from them the conclusion that the outside interests which were competing with the docks were rather gaining in the competition and the docks were rather losing. Then there was another matter. The engineering expert was asked—

> "Are you satisfied that the docks are in a condition to enable them to maintain the income which they are making now?"

His answers were quite definite. A certain Member said—

> "We ought to know a little more than that. We ought to know whether they are in a position to meet the changing conditions of trade, whether they are in a position, not only assuming that trade is to be done exactly in the way it has been done up till now, but assuming it is to be done in perhaps a different way to meet those charges."

This was the question—

> "You did not give any consideration to that point of view when you examined the docks?"

The answer was—

> "No, I cannot say I did pay any special attention to that."

The real fact was that in his opinion they had paid full value and rather more than full value for the docks, but that did not enable him by any means to condemn the Government. They had had experience in many other ways of arbitration, and, curiously enough, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to use as an argument against the Bill what had happened in regard to the Water Board, although they all knew the amount paid by the Water Board was the result of arbitration, and he, for one, believed, though it might be open to argument, that taking the cost simply they had got the docks cheaper by agreement than they would have got them if they had left it to arbitration. That was the whole essence of the case, and that was his opinion. But all the same, he thought it was a kind of proceeding which was pretty dangerous. Apart altogether from recrimination from one side of the House against the other, there was a great danger of mistake being made in this as in other trade dealings, and though he believed they would get on better by making a business bargain, he was not sure that it was a wise course for the Government to adopt, or he would be glad to see this precedent followed in similar cases. There was only one other word he wished to say before he sat down. He would not condemn what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done in regard to the Bill, but he remembered on the Second Reading a good many Members contrasted the brilliant achievement which they had made with the poor result that the late Government achieved. Even now, if he had been responsible for bringing forward a Bill like this, he would first of all have tried to do it on an entirely different footing as regards finance. In making a big amalgamation of this kind one of the great savings which people hoped to make was getting their money cheaper, and therefore making a saving of interest. There was nothing of that kind here. The new docks were paid for not by capital, which they could borrow on cheaper terms, but by giving an equivalent income, so that they gained nothing from the point of view of cheaper money by making the amalgamation. The Bill, as the late Government proposed it, was to get get from the County Council a guarantee of the payment of the interest on the debt. Ha knew some hon. friends very much disliked that proposal. He thought it right, and he thought it right now, for this reason: that the interest of the port and of the City were so intimately connected that anything which saved money to the port was a direct advantage to the City. If he had been in the position of the President of the Board of Trade he would first of all have tried to arrange it on that basis.

SIR H. KEARLEY: They refused to make any contribution whatever.

MR. BONAR LAW: I think not.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD (Glasgow, St. Rollox): I can assure the hon. Gentleman that is so.

MR. BONAR LAW: I am speaking with some knowledge of what took place with the majority of the Council at that time.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD: I had the honour to be a member of the body at that time. I pressed the policy on them very strongly. The County Council, when the hon. Gentleman was concerned in bringing in the Bill, supported him and offered to give a guarantee. I was in favour of continuing that policy and pressed it on the County Council and they absolutely refused.

MR. BONAR LAW: I must accept that with some qualification for this reason, that the Motion which the hon. Gentleman pressed on the County Council was not merely a question of guarantee by itself, but the question of contributing something towards the expenses, which was a very different thing. That is my recollection of what took place.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD: I must make the matter quite plain. The guarantee was pressed separately on the Council quite independently of that, and refused absolutely.

MR. BONAR LAW said that probably the hon. Gentleman was right, but it was not his recollection. The average rate of money paid by big corporations like London, Manchester, Liverpool, and Glasgow was 3¼ per cent. If they had raised this £23,000,000 on the same basis it would have meant an annual charge of £749,000 instead of £802,000. That was to say it would have been a saving to the new Port authority of more than £50,000 a year. He was convinced, whatever the hon. Gentleman might think of what took place at the County Council, that the matter was never pressed from that point of view alone, and he thought the Board of Trade would have been wise to make a first effort to settle the matter on that basis.

*MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) said that looking at this as a question of balance of advantage, he felt obliged to vote for the Government Bill. He did this with some hesitation because, looking at the point of maintainable income, he felt it was still likely to be very much impaired. There were danger signals which the Board of Trade had not perhaps paid sufficient attention to. First of all, if he looked at the dock companies case, in their Bill of 1907, when they were proposing to provide a dock for £2,000,000 and they had to present a budget of what their financial requirements were likely to be, he found reading these conditions, which were not dissimilar to the conditions that the new Port authority would have to face, they proposed to put dues on goods to the tune of more than £500,000. The London and India Dock Company themselves asked for an extra revenue from dues on goods of £270,000. He had taken the figure from the statement issued by the dock company. He felt, therefore, that when the Board of Trade assured the House that £180,000 was likely to be the limit of the port dues which would be levied, they were taking an exceedingly sanguine view, and he was afraid they did not realise the full danger to which the trade of London was likely to be subject. There was another danger signal. Looking at the figures that these three companies had been putting on one side for maintenance, repairs, and depreciation, he was certain they were altogether inadequate to the sums the new authority would have to spend. He felt that the maintainable income would be impaired by at least £100,000 which the new authority would find it absolutely necessary to spend in keeping the docks in the condition which would then be demanded. Besides, the purchase had been in the air. It was only common prudence on the part of the directors to keep down their expenditure on this head as much as possible, and one would expect to find that these maintenance figures, on which very largely depended the maintainable income, had been kept at a minimum. He had not been able to check it, but he had seen it stated that in the old days the dock company themselves were accustomed to spend a sum roughly aproaching £200,000 instead of the £93,000 they had done in the last few years. He therefore felt that the present income could not be maintained, because of necessity there must be a dropping of the dues on ships and an increase in the cost of repairs and maintenance. He hoped the Government would be prepared at some portion of the Bill to put a limit on the port dues they proposed to raise. At present there was an unlimited liability on the trade and commerce of London, and the situation was so dangerous that unless the Government put some limit into the Bill, he might be obliged on the Third Reading to vote against it. He understood, however, that the Government were likely to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! That does not arise under this clause.

*MR. W. PEARCE said that he wished to point out the other side of the case and state why he felt obliged to vote for the Bill. In the first place, if this Bill was refused there was not likely to be another Government Bill for a long while, and it would mean the hanging up of this question for an indefinite period. They had been waiting ten years for a new dock to accommodate big ships, because the present accommodation was fully exhausted. The dock companies were not able to undertake such work, and in consequence of this Bill for some time past various works right along the river had been hung up. The reason for this had been that the large wharves and large business enterprises had stopped their development expenditure because they had been uncertain whether the docks were going to be purchased or not, and therefore it was in the general interests of trade that the whole matter should be finally settled. He thought the Port of London had suffered by the general discussions on this question which had taken place during the last two or three years, and if they had a new authority of reputation established, it might do a good deal to recover London's commercial position. It should not be overlooked that this Bill enabled the Port authority to get hold of the valuable vacant land in the present dock, and it was only by such arrangements as these that those sites could be obtained which were the most suitable for the purpose. There was a large tract of land adjoining the Albert and Victoria Docks suitable for dock extension, and, as a matter of fact, it was the only piece of land suitable for the purpose. Under the arrangements made in this Bill, that land came into the hands of the new authority. He spoke with a good deal of responsibility upon this question, because he had had much experience, not only in business, but locally, for he represented a constituency in the East End of London in which he had had business relations all his life. Looking at this matter he had no hesitation in saying that to the best of his judgment—and he might say that he felt a great deal of anxiety on the question—he was bound to support the Government in passing Clause 3.

*MR. McLAREN (Staffordshire, W.) said the hon. Member for Dulwich had suggested that the Government would have done better and might have saved a lot of money if they had induced the London County Council to guarantee the port stock. Apart from the unwillingness of the London County Council to enter into such a guarantee he wished to make this point—the bargain entered into by the Government was not made upon a cash basis but on the basis of an exchange of stock. If it had been contemplated to issue stock upon the market and pay out the existing dock shareholders in cash there would have been a very considerable saving realised by the course which the hon. Member for Dulwich suggested. He would, however, remind the Committee that not only was it a very difficult time now to issue a large amount of stock upon the market, but if this had been done those present holders of port stock who re-invested in the County Council guaranteed stock would have had to put up with a smaller income, and that was one of the considerations which influenced the directors who were responsible for the conduct of the dock companies. Naturally it influenced their minds, because they believed their shareholders under the proposed arrangement would get an income exactly equal or nearly equal to that which they had been getting in the past. For all practical purposes the debenture holders and the preference shareholders of most of these dock companies had a well secured revenue, and if they had asked them to exchange their stock for one with a smaller revenue, even though it had been better secured by a County Council guarantee, it was very unlikely that they would have acceded to that proposition. Had they not acceded they would have had to give them a larger amount of County Council guaranteed stock in order to make their income equal to the income of the past. Therefore the saving that the hon. Member for Dulwich suggested could have been made might have been in this way reduced to perhaps very moderate proportions. He was interested to hear that the hon. Member for Dulwich did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington either in the gravamen of his charge against the Government or in the remedies which he suggested. He thought the gravamen of the right hon. Gentleman's charge was very largely that the price given was excessive. The steps which the right hon. Gentleman suggested might have been taken were, in the first place, arbitration, and in the second place that the Government ought to have based the purchase on a capital valuation. He also complained that the Government had not acted as business men in the matter. He was aware that business men very often did resort to arbitration, but as far as his information and observation went they usually resorted to arbitration when they had a thing to sell and not when they had something to buy. He did not know whether any hon. Member knew in his own personal experience of an instance where there had been compulsory arbitration in which the seller of property had not got more than his full market value. He thought that, in this instance, as in the case of the Water Board, if the Government had resorted to arbitration, and more especially if they had resorted to compulsory acquisition and arbitration, they would probably have had to pay a largely enhanced price. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington said the valuation had not been made upon a capital basis. How were they going to value a dock on a capital basis? After all they could not value the site of a dock in the light of its being used ultimately for building cottage property or erecting factories. All they could do was to value the property as a dock, and the only criterion of the value of a dock was what it could earn. The money spent in the making of a dock was no criterion at all, and therefore the only possible mode of valuation was a valuation based on the income and not upon the capital value. He would urge upon the Committee that if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington wished to prove his case, if he wished to prove that because of the price at which the docks had been taken over a burden was going to be placed upon the trade of London, he had got to prove not only that the dock receipts would not increase but that they would actually diminish, because at present, as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade had shown, there was a profit, although it was a very slight one, on the transaction. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no."]

MR. LOUGH: Not in the last three years, because the receipts show a positive decrease.

*MR. McLAREN replied that the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that in the last three years there had been very exceptional circumstances which had made the profit of the docks—or at any rate of two of the dock undertakings, namely, the Surrey and Millwall Docks —a great deal less than they would otherwise have been. The question had been asked why it was that in a period of unexampled prosperity there had been such a falling off in the earnings of these docks. He defied anyone to prove that any hon. Member of the Committee had ever said that the last three years had been a period of unexampled prosperity in the building trade, and it was well known that it was the building trade imports which formed a very large proportion of the dock revenues. He would also submit to the Committee that during the last three years there had been a great many disturbances in the corn-growing areas in the Baltic, in Russia, and in that portion of the world from which our corn imports were largely drawn, and which in the past had supplied the Surrey and Millwall Docks with a large proportion of their trade and revenue. He submitted that it was much fairer to take the good years with the lean years in striking an average of profits, and, therefore, it was quite fair to go back over a period of six years and not three years as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington had suggested. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to prove that this Bill would place a burden on the trade of London, it was incumbent upon him to prove that the average trade for the past six years was less, or that the working expenses would be greater than had been estimated. He had suggested that a great deal of money would have to be spent in putting the docks into proper working order, but it was the universal experience of all those concerned in business of any kind that when they put money into improvements, be it a dock company, a railway company, or any other concern, the money spent was generally wisely spent, and generally led to a larger return than the old capital. He could conceive that if the new authority had to spend many millions in improving equipments and altering the docks, that capital would bring in a return exceeding the return on the old capital invested, and in that way would yield an additional profit to the Port authority. If it was urged that the trade of the docks would fall off, he would ask, where was that trade going to? Was it going to desert the docks and go to the river instead? The expenditure of money which the new dock authority would incur in improving the docks—if they had that total trade in the Port which was there at the present time—would surely enable them to keep the trade. Surely it might be hoped that the increased facilities which would be provided would attract increased trade, and that the trade would not be allowed to go away to other people. He had thought that the objections to this Bill which had come from the wharfingers and those interested in some of the riverside industries had been due to fears that the improvement of the facilities in the docks would have the effect of diverting a portion of the trade from the wharves into the docks. It was proposed to have an authority for controlling the Port which, perhaps, taken all round—and he was sure the right hon. Member for Islington would be the last to deny this—had the rosiest prospects of any port in the world. There was a vaster and a more constantly increasing population in London than in any other portion of the world. The Committee could hardly believe that any loss would be incurred by the new authority through a diminution in the trade of the Port of London.

*MR. STEADMAN thought the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade replied to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington in what he would describe as a rather theatrical manner. He was astonished that the hon. Gentleman shielded his own position behind that of the late President of the Board of Trade. Mr. Gerald Balfour was a leading Member of the Conservative Party, and he could quite easily understand his position, but he could not understand the position of the present Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade for this reason. Mr. Gerald Balfour was a member of a party whom Radicals outside always abused. They said to the people: "Oh! do not send them to Parliament; they are the party of privilege and monopoly. We are democrats, and we will support measures on behalf of the people." Well, he supposed the hon. Gentleman would go down to Devonport and say that to the voters On statements of that kind he got returned to the House, and when he had an opportunity of defending the administration of his Department he did not stand on his own merits, but fell back on an ex-Minister belonging to the Tory Party in order to shield himself. He was not a capitalist. He knew nothing about finance as compared with the majority of the Members of the House. When they were dealing with a matter of this magnitude it was always puzzling to know when hon. and right hon. Gentlemen get up to speak, how far they were financially interested in the subject before the House. That applied to both parties. There were two parties who in years past had been wrongfully abused, but only through the ignorance of the people who had been abusing them. One was the dock companies, and the other the Thames Conservancy Board. He said that without fear or hesitation, and he held no brief for the dock companies. The dock companies had done their level best to cope with the growing traffic of the river, but they had absolutely failed. An hon. Member spoke of St. Catherine's Dock and Commercial Dock—one at Wapping, and the other at Shadwell. At the Limehouse reach there was the West India Dock and the South Dock. When he was a young man those docks up the river were hives of industry. If the present President of the Local Government Board were to go down to the West India Dock, where he saw the right hon. Gentleman twenty years ago, to address, or attempt to address, a crowd of dockers from the top of a hansom cab, instead of getting thousands round him as he once did he would not get hundreds. The South Dock was at one time a timber pond, and it was made into a dock in order to cope with the increased traffic on the river. Millwall Docks were built in his time. There was also the Surrey Commercial Dock. Well, the owners had no desire that the Government should buy that dock. He happened to know two of the directors of that dock. It was the best paying dock in the river. They had spent over a million of money in making a new entrance at the lower end. The south entrance was in the Limehouse reach, and the other in the Blackwall reach. These docks ran quite parallel with what was known as the Isle of Dogs. In connection with the South Dock a lot of money was laid out some years ago in order to cope with the larger ships which were being built. The entrance was widened at the Blackwall end. The East India Dock was also a great work. They could not go there at one time without finding it crowded with ships. He went to that dock a few months ago, and there was not a ship at work in the dock. It was intended to accommodate the ships of the Castle Line, and on making inquiries he was told that the new basin could not accommodate the larger ships of that line. They were only doing one a week, instead of two. The ships were going to Southampton. He mentioned this to the hon. Member for Woolwich. He said to him: "There, Bill, you have the answer to the poverty in Poplar." Then they came to the Victoria Docks and the Albert Docks, which had been built in his time, and yet to-day they were years behind the other ports. That proved to him that the dock companies had invested their money and done their level best to cope with the requirements of the Port of London, but they had failed. He asked any one of the capitalists in the House of Commons—men who knew business, otherwise they would not accumulate money as they did—whether they would be foolish enough to purchase a business that was absolutely played out. Men did not make money in that way.

Why buy a thing because they had public money to handle which they would not buy if they were spending their own money? If he were to open, say, a grocer's shop in any district, and if he were doing a good business and making a decent living, the business might be destroyed through the competition of one of those gigantic companies which were formed nowadays. The working classes of this country had to fight for all they were worth against the combinations of capitalists. Wealth was the one thing which was socialised in this country to-day. If he were a grocer whose business was destroyed in the way he had indicated he could not come to Parliament for compensation. He would have to put up with it. For all the world cared, a man in these circumstances might starve outside or go into the workhouse. He did not want the President of the Board of Trade to take his word alone in regard to the docks. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to pay a surprise visit with one of his own officials to the West India Docks, or some of the other docks, in order to see for himself the state they were in at the present time. He had nothing to say against the two experts who were employed by the Government, especially the actuary, but he did say as a mechanic that the engineer, however able he might be, could not in a period of fourteen days thoroughly overhaul the docks to ascertain whether they were in good working condition or not. The Thames Conservancy Board had been accused of neglecting its work with reference to the dredging of the river. Well, they deserved only a portion of the blame. He was a member of the Board and when the question of dredging was raised they were always met with the cry, "We have got no money." Some years ago they were dredging below Woolwich. There was a factory on the river bank and the dredging was undermining the foundations of the factory. The owners got an injunction and stopped the work. The river could not be dredged even up to Blackwall, to say nothing of the channel near the Tower Bridge. At Blackwall they were met by the tunnel, and they could not get any more depth of water there than they had now. The river banks down to Silvertown were a mass of warehouses and factories. They could not dredge the river there, because the moment they attempted it they undermined the factories, Now, they could get a depth of water of 35 feet at Gravesend; but the dock companies might say: "It is no use of us doing anything at all to our docks, because the Thames Conservancy do not give us the depth of water." His answer to that was that if there was a depth of water of 35 feet at Gravesend, the ships could not get into Tilbury at low water, because they had the sill to contend with, and they could not get 35 feet on the sill at low water. He was in hopes that this Bill would have compelled them to get that depth. He had the honour of being one of twelve members of the Thames Conservancy which visited the ports of Rotterdam, Antwerp, Bremen, Bremen-Haven, and Hamburg, and he said to his colleagues when they were at Antwerp on the River Scheldt: "That is what we want on the River Thames." They all admitted that it could be done. "Oh, but," said he, "we are bound hand and foot on the River Thames with the private monopoly of the dock companies." He knew that at Antwerp they had a small dock company in some form or other, but they had made the improvements nevertheless, and a good deal more. He knew of a man who bought recently London Dock stock at 90 which was going to bring in 3 or 4 per cent. interest. This was no fairy tale. An ordinary tradesman had to submit to competition and put up with the loss of profit. Why should not the dock companies do the same? It could not be supposed that the men who found the capital to build these docks did it to accommodate the shipowners. They did it because they knew there was money in it; and they had made their money. The fact was that these docks, like the railways, ought to belong to the State. What the dock companies ought to have done long years ago the State itself ought to have done, and not the big capitalists. The Thames Conservancy, with all its faults, passed a large plan for a deep water jetty, but it had to go up to the Board of Trade. That was where he objected to the inte ference of the Board of Trade. The Thames Conservancy could not pass a bye-law to regulate the traffic on the river without submitting it to the Board of Trade.

*THE CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member is really going very wide of the point, which is that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

*MR. STEADMAN said that he understood that the point before the Committee at the present moment was Clause 3, which dealt with the purchase of the dock companies' undertakings. His point was that the Board of Trade were interfering too much with this problem. He wanted to know from the Board of Trade what right they had to create a new Port authority, and before doing so, to go and purchase the docks, to the tune of £22,500,000, in order to hand them over to the new Port authority, so as to be a load round their neck for years to come. He knew that that was like the Licensing Bill. They were saddling the new Port authority with these docks, just as they were nanging a burden on the necks of the tied-house men so as to compel them to pay a high rate of interest on the money going through their hands. His remedy for that was that the Board of Trade ought to have created the new Port authority and left the docks alone, or given the new Port authority the option of purchasing them if they wanted to do so. But failing purchase their object ought to have been to compete with the dock companies. Of all the Continental ports be had visited he was most struck with Antwerp. They had a fine large dock there and they were building a much larger one. Apart from the docks they had some miles of wharfage, and ships came up alongside the wharves on which there was the railway. The goods were transferred direct to the railway trucks or else into barges which had a capacity of carrying 2,000 or 3,000 tons. He wanted to see the Port of London succeed, and he hoped and trusted that this Bill, which the Government were bound to carry as they had made up their minds to it, would do all that they expected it to do. But he maintained that the real solution of the success of the Port of London was not the docks but deep-water jetties. He would let all the docks up the river alone and buy up all the land between the Albert Dock and the Tilbury Dock and turn it into one gigantic dock. He would give the docks 35 feet of water with new entrances so that the largest ship afloat to-day might get into them. Besides that he would provide deep-water jetties that would accommodate the largest ships. That, of course, would mean millions of money. But the Belgian Government handed over to the municipality of Antwerp £8,000,000 for their improvements. The whole thing was managed by the municipality with the assistance of subsidies which the Government gave to the municipality. But they would not get that here, especially just now. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had his sympathy, he could assure him. The right hon. Gentleman was in a bit of a tight corner just now. Still, he had faith in him. He knew the right hon. Gentleman had a large heart and would do a jolly sight more than he did if he had the means. Unfortunately, he had not the means. In his judgment that was the only thing that would remedy the unsatisfactory state of things that existed on the River Thames at the present moment. He was sorry to admit it, but the great curse of this country was cheapness. Competition was run so fine that it would not pay the big shipowners to have their ships lying idle for a tide before they could get into a dock. Wages were running on, and that meant a large loss on big vessels. When he was at Hamburg he went on board one of the German boats, and a fine ship it was. But when they got to the river there was not enough water for the ship and they had to land in a tender. It was the same at Bremen Haven. But when they came to Southampton they found thirty-six feet of water and the biggest ships went there bang alongside the jetty without any waste of time. The passengers were landed, and the ship got her coal without delay. That was what they wanted in our London river. The President of the Board of Trade told him that the new port authority would have power to build deep-water jetties; but would they do it? Where were they going to get the money? He maintained that every penny-piece they put on dues in this port was going not to increase the trade but to take the trade away. London, at present, was the cheapest port in the world, and that was the reason of its great commerce; but if they put dues on goods they would destroy that trade, and after all the merchant did not pay these dues although he might do so at first hand——

*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise on this clause.

MR. STEADMAN said he was sorry; but, after all, the dues fell upon the consumer, in his judgment. In conclusion all he had to say was that although he was opposed to buying out the docks, he was as earnest as the Government in his endeavour to improve the Port of London, and he wished the Bill every success which the Government themselves hoped for.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The debate has now proceeded for a good many hours, and I think the Committee is in a position very shortly to come to a decision on the question under discussion. I think that hon. Gentlemen who have listened to this debate must have been struck at the inevitable character of the purpose of the Government to carry the Bill through. At almost every step it has been forced upon us by overwhelming arguments and by the force of circumstances. The first question is whether the docks should be purchased or not. A Liberal Bill introduced by my right hon. friend, a Conservative Bill introduced by the late Government, and the Report of the Royal Commission—all equally affirmed the principle that the purchase of the docks should be an integral part of any scheme for the establishment of a real Port authority for London. If that be the first step to which I say we are driven by the practically irresistible process of circumstances, the next step is the sharp alternative between purchase by arbitration rather than by purchase by agreement. Of course, there are advantages on either side. But after having heard the admirable defence of purchase by agreement which my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade has given to the House, and also having heard the very generous admission of the hon. Member for Dulwich that upon the whole he was of opinion that better terms would be got by agreement than would be got by arbitration, the House is aware that at any rate we know exactly where we are after having purchased by agreement, and we are not exposed to any of those indefinite chances which are the result of arbitration, especially where the value of the property is subject to many varying and complex conditions. If then we are brought to have to choose between arbitration and agreement, we are drawn to the conclusion that agreement is the right way, and we come directly to the question now before the Committee. My right hon. friend the Member for Islington has his own views of the terms of the agreement, and as every one knows, he has explained those views very fully, but the Committee will realise that purchase by agreement means purchase by agreement. It means that the buyer and seller must come to an agreement about the terms, and if that is so, it is really not open to anyone to assert, as did the hon. Gentleman opposite, that these docks ought to have been purchased by agreement for much less. The method employed by the Government has been fully explained. An actuarial inquiry was made with full knowledge to ascertain the true value. Engineering inquiry was made, not in order to ascertain whether the docks were up to date, or whether they were perfect for the purposes suitable for a great city, but in order to ascertain whether the earning capacity of those docks relatively to the ascertained income was adequately maintained. It was conducted by an engineer whose authority has never been challenged, whose discretion was never impugned. During the inquiry for two or three months upstairs, no one was brought forward—no serious witness was brought forward, no engineer, and no one of experience in the management of docks came to impugn in any way the experience or opinion of Mr. Cruttwell, that the earning capacity of the docks had been adequately maintained and that there was no depreciation of the proper capital value. We are told that these docks are obsolete and have long been neglected, but they have had spent on them during the last six years an average of £125,000 a year, and in the year 1907 no less than £127,000 was expended on the improvement of these docks. But it is no part of the Government case that the docks which have been purchased are in every respect up to date. On the contrary, every argument which is used to show that they were obsolete or obsolescent and unsuited to the needs of the city—to show that they had a hampering effect upon trade, is an argument which proves the urgency of the measure which we have under consideration. When my right hon. friend the Member for Islington tells us that in his opinion these docks are obsolete, that their gates are never opened and ships cannot get in——

MR. LOUGH: Some gates.

MR. CHURCHILL: When he tells us that some of their gates are never opened and ships cannot get in, that the warehouses are not opened and the docks are unsuitable for trade, when the right hon. Gentleman makes all these statements, they have not, I can assure the Committee, the slightest connection with the actual facts. In 1907, the London and India Docks alone disposed of over 7,000,000 tons of shipping and 11,000,000 tons of goods. But if these statements which are put forward by the right hon. Gentleman were as true as they are untrue, if they were as accurate as they are inaccurate, that would be the most powerful argument that could be advanced for the Committee's resolutely pushing forward with this Bill, which alone can effectually remedy such a deplorable state of things. When therefore, my right hon. friend speaks of a shady transaction, a shady business——

MR. LOUGH: I did not say that.

MR. CHURCHILL: I wrote down the words "shady business," and when he makes use of such strong language in criticising financial proposals put before the Committee in good faith on behalf of the Government, I should like to know where was the right hon. Gentleman when these proposals were put forward. The right hon. Gentleman has special business aptitude, he is connected with London and has a special knowledge of it and London affairs. The right hon. Gentleman was a member of the Government long after my right hon. friend's scheme was made public and the Bill was printed and laid before this House. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman come forward, if not publicly at any rate in the Government, to give them the advantage of his counsel in these matters? He saw these transactions and he saw these disadvantages. He saw these shady transactions take place, and not one single moment did he spare from his labours at the Education Department to lend a hand to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in connection with this Bill. I venture to think the right hon. Gentleman has approached the subject this afternoon in a mood and with an expression that I think are not worthy of himself at his best. And when I turn from the question of the methods which we have employed, which really are not seriously challenged in any part of the House, to the price, I have only one observation to make to epitomise the discussion which has taken place. A price fixed by agreement will not enable you to make persons who possess existing properties accept an appreciably lower income than they have on the average been receiving. You will not get people to accept half or three-quarters of the income they have been accustomed to, but with that general reservation I say we have taken over these great properties substantially at their actual and real value. If you look at the income my hon. friend the Secretary to the Board of Trade has shown, it appears that we have purchased for stock which will show £800,000 interest, a stock which will show a value of £809,000 a year. It is quite true that it is only just a balance, but it is not to be expected that any greater advantage than that could be gained. If you take the Stock Exchange value, the average market value for six years of the old stocks which are still extant, would be about twenty millions and a half, and if you compare that with the Board stock so far as we can accurately forecast it, it is not anticipated that the average value of that stock issued will be above twenty-one millions. I only ask that hon. Members will not accept statements as wild as those of the right hon. Gentleman, and will consider that the margin of unthriftiness under this bargain must at any rate be exceedingly small—a million or two one way or the other, and which way is an absolutely disputable and arguable point. When the narrow and almost exact balance has been established between the old and the new stock which is created, let the Committee also remember that no account whatever is taken of the undeveloped land. I do not wish to go into that at length, but there are 750 acres of land situated in close contiguity to the docks, which will be of the greatest possible value. The average prices for which the land was purchased are known and they are very high. [AN HON. MEMBER: £400,000.] Thirty or forty years ago £400,000 was paid for the land, and there has been the great appreciation of value which has attended urban sites. These lands were valued by the companies at £1,600,000. So far as the evidence goes the Government are inclined to think that this is more than the actual value, but if we take it at half, or £800,000, a figure markedly within the limits of actuality, it would be equivalent to a premium on the whole transaction of 3·74 per cent. That is the case for purchase in its simplest terms, that there is a practical equation as regards the benefits which the holders of the stock will receive and a balance in our favour of the undeveloped land with all its advantages, once adequate capital is brought to bear upon it. But I should not be dealing fairly with the Committee if I were not to face the argument which has been used, that even if an equal income has been exchanged, the holders of the old stock surrendered a precarious and fluctuating income for an absolutely certain one. I advise the Committee to realise, in the first place, that the extant stocks of the dock companies were of very varying value. There is, first of all, a group of £16,500,000 of preference debenture and other stock of the highest possible class, and it is not in the least true to say that is precarious and fluctuating, because over the whole area of finance that security was established by payments extending over a long period of time. In the next category you have between £5,500,000 and £6,000,000 of deferred and ordinary stock. For these we have paid the "B. stock" to the value of £220,000 a year. During the last six years the average annual interest yielded on this stock was £228,000 a year. So that even on this second class of commodity the bargain can be shown to yield a balance, a very slight balance, in regard to the interest payable on the port stock as against the income derivable under the old system. There remains only one class further of securities—about £1,000,000 worth of very junior securities. They are of uncertain value, but they are certainly of some value. That £1,000,000 worth of securities we have purchased by agreement for £342,000. It must be remembered that although some of those securities have not paid a dividend in the years immediately preceding the purchase they are nevertheless valuable and marketable commodities, and that the value of these securities on the Stock Exchange and in the market so far as it can be estimated is, I am informed, far in excess of the £342,000 which we have paid for them. Again, I say in estimating the value of these stocks it must be remembered that the stock holders of all classes are entitled to their share in the value of the undeveloped lands and what might come out of it, and that any scheme of arbitration would have to take into consideration their substantial claims in that important respect. I venture to submit to the Committee that the bargain that has been made is, first of all, the best that could have been made under the circumstances in which we stand. Of course I agree with the hon. Gentlemen opposite that it would have been a very good thing if the London County Council, the great London authority, had been able to come forward and lend its credit to guarantee the finance of the dock authority. I should have much preferred that. I should have very much liked to have seen that life between the London Port Authority and the London County Council grow in the future. But that was not open to us; the advantages of that course were not open to us. I have that from my right hon. friend. The House knows perfectly well that if anybody could persuade a Moderate or Progressive majority of the London County Council to favour such a scheme it would be my right hon. friend. But his sweetness was wasted on the desert air. We, therefore, cannot be blamed for not having the advantage of their support. I will take occasion when we reach the next clause to relieve the anxiety which has been expressed with regard to the burden which will be placed on the trade of the Port, and I think I shall be able to show that the bargain which we have made is not a hard bargain, but on the contrary a thrifty one, and I think it will be not less easy to show that the fear expressed by hon. Members is unfounded. I should be out of order in referring to that now. What remains? Only this other point as it seems to me. I mean the future of the Port in its financial and commercial sense. We have heard the most gloomy prophecies and the most melancholy predictions. We are told the change is not desired by persons who have ignored the fact that the timber trade has been disorganised, that the building trade through high rates for money has been much depressed, and that the grain import trade has been much disturbed in the last few years; and that the companies have themselves reduced their profits by protracted and fierce rate wars one against another. We do not believe that the future of the docks of London and the Port of London will be dark or restricted. We claim a free hand for the Port Authority, and shall all through this Bill ask the House to put them in as good a position to face their difficulties and solve their problems as if they were a private concern in all that is legitimate and fair. If that is done, we have good hopes for the future. We count on the economies of concentrated management; we count on the revival which fresh capital and improvements only can give to the high-class shipping of the Port; we count on the utilisation of vacant lands and on the reopening of the Greenland Dock, and the steady development of that most valuable property which has as yet scarcely begun to form part of the Revenue; and lastly we count on London, on the steady and ever unbroken expansion of the trade and wealth of this great city, which we believe must continue inevitably by every improvement in science, the continuation of peace, and the spread of civilisation throughout the world. I hope the House will now come to a decision on the purchase terms, that when they come to that decision on the purchase terms they will understand what it really means. Let us decide once and for all whether the bargain is a good or a bad one. If we decide that it is a bad one, then this Bill must go. The scheme which is put forward will be rejected, the large public works that are being constructed in consequence of this Bill will be arrested, the enterprise which we desire to be centred in the Port of London will be prevented; and the docks which we are told are obsolete will be left to obsolesce into obsoleteness. But I believe that the decision of the Committee will show that we have acted judiciously and thriftily on the lines on which Governments and individuals alike may go. I take it that the decision may be taken as governing the bargain, because, I must remind the Committee that all parts of the bargain are absolutely interdependent, and the pulling out of any one part of this arrangement must absolutely destroy the whole basis on which it was arranged. Twenty conflicting interests have been adjusted in one way or another, and it is not possible for me to vary the details of the bargain without destroying the whole edifice which has been erected with so much patience, labour, and skill by my right hon. friend. I hope the House will recognise this, and discarding the weak cries of pusillanimity and suspicion which have been raised in one quarter and another, affirm that by a thrifty financial operation the Port of London is to be set free to maintain the position of this great city in the commercial supremacy of the world.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said he had listened to the whole of the debate upon this Amendment, and while he quite recognised the ability with which the President and the Secretary of the Board of Trade had put forward the case of the terms upon which it was proposed to purchase these docks, he had failed to find, with the exception of the right hon. Gentleman and one hon. Member below the gangway, that the case had been put before the House as to whether these docks ought to be bought or not. He was not in the House at the time when the Bill was before the Committee, but he understood that before the Committee the principle of buying the docks was not allowed to be discussed. He was in the House during the last Parliament and took a keen interest in the Bills introduced by the late Government in 1902 and 1903 in connection with this important question. In 1903 he headed a deputation of shipowners to the then President of the Board of Trade. He also made a speech in the House on the question, and ever since then he had taken a very keen interest in this important subject. Although he represented a northern constituency he claimed to have as great a knowledge of the Port of London as any hon. Member representing London. His business took him down to the docks two or three times every week, and he knew something about the docks of London. He had not the slightest hesitation in associating himself with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Islington in his declaration that it was inexpedient to saddle the Port authority with the purchase of these docks. He believed that the purchase would hang like a millstone round the neck of the new authority, and that the reason the Bills of the late Government failed to pass was the doubt in the mind of the House as to the expediency of purchasing the docks. Had anything happened in the last six years to render it expedient to buy these docks now? If it was inexpedient to buy them six years ago, it was more inexpedient to buy them now. They had to remember, and it was important that they should remember, that the trade of London was carried on in two departments. About half was carried on on the river, and half in the docks. He could not help wondering, if it was expedient to buy the docks where half the trade was carried on, why it was not expedient to buy the wharves on the river where the other half was carried on. If it was expedient in the one case, it was expedient in the other. They had heard from the President of the Board of Trade that the Government were getting a good bargain in buying these docks. They were buying them on the basis of the revenue value of the docks, and thought they were getting them cheap, but nothing was cheap, or a good bargain, if it was not required. He maintained that they did not want these docks, and where they were being purchased on the basis of revenue, the Committee must consider whether they would get the same revenues. He maintained that they would not. He maintained that directly the new authority took possession of these docks they would be faced with a great expenditure, not only for improving the docks themselves, but for bringing the wharves and warehouses up-to-date. He could enlighten the right hon. Gentleman as to the state of certain parts of the docks and wharves at the present time. His own firm had applied to the docks to put them in a favourable position for their business, and they had been told that they could not do so because the authorities were not prepared to put any money into the docks. They had had to meet the difficulty by putting up the buildings themselves and paying the expense. That was the position with regard to some of the docks, and he maintained it was the position with regard to them all. When the Secretary to the Board of Trade asked the Committee to approve the purchase, and instanced the Surrey Docks, it was only because the Surrey Commercial Docks were an excellent and up-to-date institution. But the remarkable thing was that the authorities of the Surrey Commercial Docks did not wish to sell to this Board. They had brought their docks up-to-date, and had done that in a much more economical way and far more cheaply than this new Board was likely to do. He could understand a Labour Member looking round the docks and saying: "Here is a field for expenditure; here is a field for work for the unemployed"; but he maintained, as he maintained six years ago in the House, that the way to develop the Port of London was not by increasing the dock accommodation, but by increasing the wharf and jetty accommodation in the river, because to all intents and purposes, where it was possible to have wharves and jetties, docks were out of it. Take the River Tyne, about which he knew something. They had there docks and wharves. The principal docks on the River Tyne did not belong to the River Tyne Commissioners; they belonged to the railway company. The River Tyne Commissioners themselves had docks, which were regular white elephants, and they would like to get rid of them. They had a demand for increased accommodation for large ships, not by way of increased dock space, but by way of riverside wharves, and he maintained that that was the proper solution of the difficulty that they have to deal with in the Port of London. He was not one who took a pessimistic view of the trade of London. He was quite aware that the trade of London went on increasing, and he said fearlessly that there was enough accommodation in the Port of London for the ships that came. They heard a good deal about large ships requiring more accommodation, but there were no ships coming to the Port of London of upwards of 600 feet in length. Take the Atlantic Transport Fleet, their vessels were 600 feet long. The P. and O. Company's ships were 550 feet, and those of the Orient Line about 500 feet. All these ships could be accommodated in the present docks. Were they willing to build new docks to accommodate larger ships? That would certainly be entering upon an enterprise, the cost of which would be enormously out of proportion to the revenue they would be likely to get. They were told that 700-feet and 750-feet ships require accommodation, but they were not likely to come to the Thames. The "Mauretania," the "Lusitania," and White Star ships were not likely to come to the Port of London, and if they did, who would propose to build a dock to accommodate them? What would it mean? They would have to build enormous docks with a great depth of water, and they would have to provide on one side of the dock nearly 300 yards of quay—for what? So that a ship might use it probably once in three or four months. If they were going to deal with large ships they would have to deal with them by constructing wharves in the river.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I really think the hon. Member is out of order on the question before the Committee. I think the hon. Gentleman is going too far afield when he talks about the accommodation of the future.

MR. RENWICK said he was endeavouring to show that the new Port authority ought not to buy these docks, but should turn to the scheme before the Committee as to how large ships ought to be dealt with. He maintained that if this large amount of money was to be spent upon the existing docks, it was not the new authority who ought to have to deal with them, but the present proprietors. When a private company lost a portion of its capital it applied to the Courts for leave to reduce its capital. They rarely found an accommodating Government, such as the dock companies had found at the present time, to step in and relieve them in respect of loss of capital. He maintained that the fact that the Surrey Commercial Docks Company had been able to keep their docks up to date threw the responsibility on the present dock owners to keep their docks also up to date, and if they were not going to do so, then it was no part of the duty of this new authority to step in and carry out those improvements themselves. If they wanted to give the new Port authority a fair chance, let them entrust them with the administration of the river, give it ample powers to extend the wharves and to build docks, if they liked, but not saddle them with an enormous outlay which he was absolutely certain they were face to face with if they were to bring these docks up to date.

*SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central) said he wished to make a few observations after the able speech of the President of the Board of Trade. There were one or two features of this subject which had not been touched upon, but which were really the crux of the whole question of the purchase of the docks, and he thought his remarks might be some reply to the hon. Member for Newcastle who had just spoken. He thought they must bear in mind that the Royal Commission, the late Government, and the present Government determined, when they considered this question, that the docks must be purchased as the property of the

Port of London, and he thought also, that they should bear in mind something of the history of the Port of London. They had to bear in mind that long before the docks they had a free river, they had free water; and when the docks were permitted to be built under legislative sanction free water was still retained. That was all very well so long as the docks had a monopoly, and then when that monopoly ceased, they still had the advantage of the protective policy under which this country was then living, and which practically drew all the goods into the dock warehouses. But when free trade was introduced gradually goods left the docks to come closer to the actual market, and when, in 1866, Mr. Gladstone swept away practically all the remaining duties, with the exception, of course, of a few special ones, it went from that time very hard with the docks. Those who had since that time enjoyed the benefits of free water had to bear in mind that it was not all gain, and that, if they could go through that period again, they would realise that it would have been much better for them to have given up something of those privileges, and have enabled the docks to earn a sufficient income to extend their docks in harmony with the growth and size of the ships to be accommodated. From 1866 onwards the docks had been struggling against insufficient income. Though they, the users of free water, had for years had that advantage, they had had the great disadvantage that the larger ships had not been sufficiently directed to London, and that in some cases they had not been able to come, and consequently they had lost their share of the trade that those ships would have brought with them. He thought this was a point which had not been mentioned all through the discussion in Committee, and he thought it was a very important question for consideration. He had had to do with commerce in the City of London for forty-three years. He occupied, at the present moment, an official position in connection with commerce, and he honestly said that he would not willingly vote for any measure that would inflict increased burdens upon the commerce of London. He knew the position of both sides. He knew that not only had every Government who had looked into the question thought it necessary to purchase the docks, but the whole history of the docks and the history of the port of London made it expedient in every way. With regard to the question if it was right to purchase, he replied yes. Whether they were buying in the right way and whether at the right price he frankly said that was one of his anxieties on the Committee, and if he criticised the Board of Trade it would be to say that he did not think that they were altogether frank enough with the Committee in the information they laid before it. He felt a good deal of anxiety from time to time, and anyone who had taken the trouble to read the evidence would see that anxiety brought out in the questions he asked, and he only wished, because he thought it would have been a good deal more satisfactory at the time, that a great deal more information had been placed before the Committee. They had bought the docks—he did not say at a great bargain, but he thought at a fair price—at a lower price than they would have done if the whole matter had gone to arbitration. But about the future. With the price that had been paid were they imperilling the future of the commerce of London? Let him give two figures which were brought before them in Committee, and which he thought were extremely interesting. The tonnage that came into the River Thames and went out in the year 1906 was 29,000,000 tons. Of that, 18,000,000 tons used the river alone and never went near the docks. The other 11,000,000 tons entered the docks and went out of the docks. But of these 11,000,000 tons only 2,500,000 tons paid dock charges, so that the whole revenue of the docks of London was obtained from the 2,500,000 tons out of the 29,000,000 tons. Of course, some would say that this showed that the greater part of the trade was done in the river. But, after all, they must have docks, and they could not get larger ships into the Port of London unless they had docks suitable to accommodate them. They must remember that. They had to provide sufficient capital, and on the present lines they had not allowed the dock companies to earn sufficient revenue to raise the capital necessary to supply the dock accommodation. The hon. Member for Newcastle had raised the question of what happened to the docks during the last few years, during the time after the last Government Bill was withdrawn, a Bill which he should have been perfectly prepared to see passed. They had distinctly gone back because they had been doing nothing to provide further accommodation for the larger ships which he believed would come to London. He said that the figures which he had quoted showed that between 2,500,000 tons and 29,000,000 tons there was a splendid margin on which, if there was only a small charge made—and the charge would have to be very small—there would be sufficient to provide revenue for the purposes they required. He confessed that these figures were given to them by the representative of practically the only petitioner who really wanted to kill the Bill. Nearly all the other petitioners, as far as he understood the petitions, did not want to kill the Bill, but only wanted to get some extra privileges for themselves. The firm he referred to was William Cory and Company, who handled some 5,000,000 tons of seaborne coal out of 7,000,000 tons coming into the Thames, and who, did 90 per cent. of their trade in the River and used the docks for only 10 per cent. of it, It was a witness from this firm who gave the evidence that out of 29,000,000 tons that entered and went out of the Port of London, only 2,500,000 tons paid dock charges. It appeared to him that that fact was one of the most hopeful features in connection with the whole matter. While he fully realised the difficulty of the position, it was a little difficult to find exactly the condition in which those docks were. The evidence before them did not altogether reassure him, but he went to see the whole of the docks and he could not help thinking that if his right hon. friend the Member for West Islington had seen the whole of the docks right away from Tower Bridge to Tilbury, including the Surrey Commercial and the Millwall, he would not have given them quite such a doleful account of their present position. It was perfectly true that the warehouses of the upper docks were the main features, but they were uncommonly well built, and were just as useful to-day as warehouses as ever they were. Considering the insufficient income that they had had he thought the dock directors and managers had simply done splendidly with the small funds at their disposal and the very fact that the dock companies had had to struggle for the last twenty or thirty years to pay even a small dividend, had produced a staff which, if properly used by the new authority, would enable them to bring this new enterprise to a success.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said that to his mind it was to be deplored that there should be any attempt to rush through a Bill of this sort, that they should have had only ten minutes on the First Reading, that the Second Reading should have been closured, that they should have been denied on inquiry before the Committee, and finally at the fag end of an exhausting autumn session they were expected to rest satisfied with this discussion. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down said they must have docks. Did he know anything about how the trade of the world was carried on? They had no docks in New York, and that was a big port where big ships went. They had no docks in Glasgow, or in Hamburg, or Rotterdam. It was an extraordinary thing that they found Members so utterly ignorant on this subject that they said there were docks in Hamburg when there were not. There were no docks at Bremen. [Cries of "Oh, yes."] He advised those people to go over the whole port with the authorities as he had done.

Mr. THORNE: I was there three weeks ago.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): So was I.

*Mr. MORTON said then they were there on some other business. There were docks at Bremerhaven and he supposed that was what they meant. There were twenty-one miles between Bremen and Bremerhaven. Now he had shown the ignorance of his hon friends. When they went to the arbitration meeting at Berlin they were in such a state that they did not know Bremerhaven from Bremen. Whether that was on account of seasickness or of drinking too much tea he could not tell, but they had proved that they were utterly ignorant of what they saw there and how they saw it. Practically at Southampton the business was done at the wharves. When he told them what his hon. friends did not know yet, that the White Star Line ships had been removed from Liverpool to Southampton—from docks to where they did not use docks—he had proved up to the hilt that they did not want docks. There was a rumour that the "Mauretania" and "Lusitania" were both going to Southampton. In Antwerp they had some docks and they were building others. He found that the Government there and the municipality and harbour authorities had settled on a new scheme of fortification, and part of the dock scheme was no doubt part of the fortifications. As a matter of fact the making of the business of Antwerp had been at the quays and wharves, and not in the docks at all. The hon. Gentleman was by this time convinced. He should think that it was possible to do business with the very largest ships without having docks at all, and every authority he had been able to consult agreed that where it was possible to have deep-water jetties, wharves or quays, that was the most suitable and the most economical for their business. The hon. Gentleman had tried to make a point about the amount of tonnage that did not go into the docks, and that which did go in but did not pay dues. It was quite true that of the twenty-nine odd million tons that came into the Thames 18,000,000 never went into the docks at all, and of the 11,000,000 that did go in 8,500,000 was loaded into barges and never put on the dock wharves at all, and might be just as well unloaded in the river. Therefore what his hon. friend proposed was that this 8,500,000 tons, to help the authority out of the scrape that they had got into should be called upon to pay dues. That, to his mind, would be a most absurd proposal. It was only fair to consider the case of Antwerp where they had some docks. Our Consul-General in his report said—

> "I mentioned that in that year the spaces allotted to vessels were re-arranged, and the most regular lines of steamers were given good berths on the river, thus avoiding the necessity of their entering the docks and the loss of time therein entailed."

He went on to say—

> "It has been mentioned to me that against the wish of shipowners they have been driven to put their ships into the docks when they wanted to use the quay."

And that was what probably would have to be done in the Thames. They would have to endeavour to take the business away from the wharves and quays for the sake of getting profits for the docks. That had been condemned very strongly by the shipowners who used Antwerp, and our own Consul said distinctly—

> "While not in any way wishing to suggest that what is the case at Antwerp would necessarily apply to other great ports, it must be stated that berths on the river quays at this point are much more sought after than berths in the docks."

He went on to say—

> "It is recognised by shipowners that river quay berths are superior to and more advantageous than dock berths at Antwerp. At Antwerp it is undoubtedly a fact that as regards saving of time and facility of manœuvring large vessels the verdict is greatly in favour of river quayage."

He went on to show that the business of the Port of Antwerp had undoubtedly been made up at the quays, and not in the docks, and that all shipowners practically now were anxious to have accommodation at the quays instead of in the docks on the ground that it was more economical. The President of the Board of Trade had accused the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Islington of making a wild speech, but he thought the speech of the President himself was a great deal more wild than the right hon. Gentleman's. He could understand him, but he could not understand the President at all. The right hon. Gentleman told the Committee that the Royal Commission and the late Tory Government and the Liberal Government had come to the conclusion that they ought to purchase the docks. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a speech a little over a year ago in which he said that he was not going to purchase the docks, and at that moment, at any rate, he had concluded not to purchase. The right hon. Gentleman went on to tell them that he did not care about any further reports of experts because all they wanted to make use of was this question of fixed income. Now the question of fixed income was looked upon differently by different authorities. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade just now stated that the profits would amount to £809,000. As a matter of fact the figures sent round to them as coming from the Joint Committee stated distinctly that the last year, namely, the year 1903, showed that the net profits were £765,101. In 1905 the figures was £665,107, and in 1906 the total was £739,872. Those were the figures for the three years. For the other three years the amount went up in one year to £850,000. He was taking the three years, which was the best way of looking at it. How they could claim the profits to be £809,000 he confessed he could not understand, but he thought he would be right in calling it very wild arithmetic. These figures showed a loss of £45,000 at least in the payment of interest alone on the new stock, because they had to pay interest whether they liked it or not if this bargain was carried out. There was no doubt there would be a loss of £45,000 to £50,000 on that transaction. Looking over the accounts of the dock companies he found that they had never made any allowance for depreciation or sinking fund, or anything of that sort, and undoubtedly there would have to be some allowance in this respect in any calculation for the future. The right hon. Gentleman did not seem to think it was absolutely necessary that his expert engineer should let them know anything about the matter beyond a general statement that it might produce a certain income if it went on as before. What he should like to know was whether that engineer had made a report in writing. He knew it was asked for by the Committee, but the Board of Trade refused to give that report. He wanted to know why they should not have that report so as to know what the engineer's opinion was as to these docks. There must be some reason for keeping back that report, and he took it that it was being kept back because it was unfavourable to the Government's proposition. If the Government would only produce that report it would settle that matter, and he hoped that even now for their own credit the Government would produce a report of their own engineer.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): Does the hon. Member say that that report was demanded by the Committee and refused?

*MR. MORTON said he knew the report was asked for on the Committee, but he did not know whether "demand" was the right word to use. It was asked for and the Board of Trade objected to producing it. It had been asked for in the House since then by his right hon. friend the Member for Islington, and it was refused on that occasion. As far as his recollection went, when people were promoting companies, and more especially when they proposed to buy property, they made no secret of the report of the engineers or experts they employed. Such reports were generally produced and sent abroad with the view of getting people to put money into the company, and they were always given as independent reports for people to judge for themselves. Having got this report, he wanted to know why the Government refused to produce it. He thought he was right in assuming that it was rather against them. In fact he could not understand any respectable professional man, desirous of saving his own professional reputation, ever making a report in favour of buying docks at the price mentioned here. He knew from his own personal experience that these docks were not in good order and they did and would want a large sum of money spent upon them before they could be brought up to date. He hoped the Government would reconsider that particular point and let them have that report, in fairness to Mr. Cruttwell himself and in fairness to everybody concerned in regard to this particular matter. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade made a speech just now, but neither in his speech nor in the speech of the President of the Board of Trade was any attempt made to show why they should purchase the docks at all. He knew the Parliamentary Secretary finished up his speech with a fine flourish such as he had often heard used by company promoters, but it was not convincing, because he told them everything would depend upon what would happen at the end of the year when there would be a fresh balance sheet which they had not seen and which they could not see yet. He told them that bad trade had had something to do with the falling-off in the trade in the river. He did not think that bad trade had affected the river at all yet. He knew that tonnage kept increasing, and it could hardly be true that bad trade was affecting the trade of the Port of London when the tonnage was on the increase. They could see this from the dues paid to the Thames Conservancy, which were increasing. He could go back a good many years, but he did not know any year when the business seemed to be going back on the river except during the war between Russia and Japan. At that period owing to the sudden removal of the Japanese vessels from the Thames they lost a little in tonnage dues in that year, but it was made up afterwards on the ending of the war. Therefore, he was not satisfied that there was anything at all in that proposition. Some hon. Members spoke about gross revenue being over £2,000,000. He could not understand what the gross revenue had to do with the matter at all, because they had to do with the net revenue of those docks and what it was likely to be by-and-bye. Then they were told that they objected to arbitration. Those who did not want anything to do with this business at all and did not desire to purchase the docks, had never said that they ought to settle this matter by arbitration or by agreement. He could understand purchasing docks if, like Glasgow, Hamburg and other places, they would thereby get command of the port. By purchasing the docks in London they did not get command of the port at all, because they left the biggest percentage, amounting to 18,000,000 tons of business, in the hands of the owners of the wharves and jetties, and they really commanded the river trade. If they were going to buy the whole lot of them up, he could understand it, but nobody had proposed to buy up the wharves and jetties, which were estimated to be worth over £100,000,000, and nobody was likely to make a proposition of that kind without seriously considering the matter. He was opposed to this clause, because he objected to purchase on the one hand, and to the price to be paid on the other hand. His opinion was that the Board of Trade had arranged to give not only more money than the docks were worth, but actually more money than they cost to construct. In his opinion they did not require these docks at all for the purpose of working the port business. If they wanted a really up-to-date dock they had better go and build it, and instead of spending £23,000,000, with another £5,000,000 to put the docks in repair, they had much better build an up-to-date dock capable of taking any vessel that could possibly come to it. If they wished to have such a dock, then build a first-class up-to-date dock such as that which was suggested in the neighbourhood of Grays, where the promoters offered to build a dock which would take all the ships that were wanted for £5,000,000. Supposing he put that at £8,000,000. If for that sum they could get a really good first-class dock capable of taking any ship or dealing with any business, surely it would be a right and proper thing to build a dock of that sort, and not pay over £23,000,000 for obsolete and useless docks. [Cries of "Divide, divide."] Was it not a fact that if they would only look after the river and promote the construction of deep-water jetties and quays they would give the traders what they want—a cheap port?

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the Clock, and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

UNEMPLOYMENT—THE ADMINISTRATION OF RELIEF GRANTS.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON rose to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to the difference between the statement of the Prime Minister regarding the future administration of the Unemployed Workmen Act and the Order issued that day by the Local Government Board. He said hon. Members on those benches had been somewhat surprised at the delay which had taken place in the issuing of the Order changing the regulations under the Unemployed Workmen Act in order to bring the regulations into harmony with the speech of the Prime Minister. When they found from the Press that morning that the Order had actually been issued, they were much more alarmed than at the delay to find that it was, in their judgment, inconsistent with the impression which had been left on all sections of the House by the Prime Minister's declaration. He desired to state accurately what the right hon. Gentleman said, and he would quote from *Hansard* the words of the right hon. Gentleman. He said—

> "When you are dealing with a special emergency like this, I am satisfied, as I believe everybody who hears me is, that you may stretch the limits which quite properly from a business point of view would be imposed when conditions were more nearly normal. Further, with regard to the special conditions under which this grant is administered, we propose they should be relaxed in two important particulars—first, so as to allow assistance to be given in proper cases to persons who have been receiving Poor Law relief during the last twelve months, who are at present excluded; and in the second place—and I think this equally important—so as to remove the disqualification of persons who have been assisted under the Act in each of the last two years. With those three modifications, elasticity in the character of the work and the removal of the disqualification in respect of Poor Law relief and assistance during the last two years, I believe the main objection which has been taken and the main criticisms of the present administration of the grant will be effectually removed."

He felt quite certain that the right hon. Gentleman would make no attempt to depart from his own words. The interpretation put upon the language—and he thought he was speaking for all sections of the House—was that the two disqualifications set up by the old Order under the Act would be removed, and, for the time being, actually done away with. He claimed the indulgence of the House in order to read two paragraphs in the new Order. The new Order provided that the distress committees might, if they thought fit, entertain an application—

> "In the case of an applicant who fails to comply with the first of the conditions mentioned, if the distress committee have satisfied themselves that the case is capable of more suitable treatment under the Act than under the Poor Law, and that it is in all other respects one which they may properly entertain. In the case of an applicant who fails to comply with the second of the conditions, if the distress committee have satisfied themselves that his case is deserving of exceptional treatment and is in all other respects one which they may properly entertain.

When he first read the Order in the Press that morning he came to the conclusion that possibly some permanent official of the Local Government Board had bungled; and it was with considerable surprise that he heard the President of the Board at Question-time, declaring that in his judgment, or in the judgment of his Department, this was the best way to carry out the engagement of the Prime Minister. But the aspect of the matter became worse when they turned to the covering letter that was sent with the Order to distress committees. In that letter the definite and conclusive statement was made that the provisions of the Order did not remove the existing disqualifications, but gave to the distress committees a discretion whereby they might waive the disqualifications in proper cases. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] Hon. Members opposite might think that this was the best position to take up. But he contended that such an interpretation was impossible if they were to accept the Prime Minister's declaration both in the letter and in the spirit. What the party for whom he spoke suggested was that this Order should be withdrawn, and that a new Order should be issued in complete harmony with the Prime Minister's declaration. If that course were adopted, they made the further request that, having regard to the delay which had already taken place, the fresh Order should be issued as soon as possible, and that it should be made retrospective, so that no further hardship should be imposed upon the unemployed who were now being denied the relief which the House intended they should have. He hoped the Government would deal with the question in the spirit in which he had dealt with it in bringing it to the notice of the House. He begged to move.

MR. W. THORNE seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I do not in the least complain of the action which the hon. Gentleman has taken, or of the manner—the moderate and reasonable manner—in which he has presented his case to the House. I meet it at once by the frankest possible admission that the language which I used was in the sense in which he has interpreted it, and as, I believe, it was universally understood. The situation was this. These two regulations excluded from the operation of the Unemployed Workmen Act persons who had been in receipt of Poor Law relief during the past twelve months, and also persons who during the past two years had been employed on work provided by a distress committee. These two restrictions were imposed, as I think for good reasons, in times of normal and not exceptional distress. But, as I said in my speech, we are now dealing with very exceptional distress, when persons who, through no fault of their own, have fallen within one or other of these two categories might fairly make a claim for relief from the disability they imposed; and I certainly contemplated and intended to convey to the House and, as I think, did actually convey to the House, that the relaxation—which was the expression I used as regards one disqualification—and the removal—which was the expression I used as regards the other—should be general and universal. I am not quite sure that I am not somewhat to blame myself for the use of the words "so as to allow of assistance to be given in proper cases." I think it is the use I made of these words that possibly has led to misapprehension and misconstruction elsewhere. What I meant—perhaps I ought to have said so in a more explicit form—was, of course, that the local authorities were to continue to exercise a proper discrimination in these two cases; that if a man has received Poor Law relief during the past twelve months, or work during the past two years, that was not to give him an indefeasible title to get relief, but that it was not to be a bar or disqualification to relief; and that subject to this, those who are entrusted with the responsibility of administering this grant were to exercise a power of discrimination. But there has been a misapprehension of my words. I can only repeat that my language might possibly have been plainer, though it was fairly plain; but that is the sense in which I intended it to be understood by the House; and I have always considered that when I, or any other Minister, have given an assurance of that kind, it ought to be construed and given effect to, not only in the letter, but in the spirit. I have talked over the matter with my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board, and he agrees with me that the phraseology of this order ought to be amended. These two disqualifications are no longer to be a bar. That is not a matter for local discretion. My right hon. friend assures me that this amendment will be made without any delay, and the moment this amended order comes into effect all applications which have been refused on the ground that they fell within these disqualifications can be renewed and treated on their merits. With that assurance I hope the hon. Gentleman will be satisfied.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON said that, having regard to the very satisfactory Answer given by the Prime Minister, he asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

PORT OF LONDON (RECOMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.

Postponed proceeding on the Question, "That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill"—resumed.

*MR. MORTON said the hon. Member for Gloucester had told them that no one who had investigated the problem could come to any other conclusion than that it would be impossible to create a new port authority which should not be a dock authority or owner of the docks. He was not proposing to criticise the Committee or their conduct, but the Committee upstairs and their Chairman decided distinctly, in the first place, that the principle of purchase should not be considered at all, and they afterwards decided that the question of the amount of purchase would not be gone into either. They said that they were not arbitrators and they left it entirely to the Board of Trade. They wanted an independent inquiry, and he did not know whether it was too late to get it now. They ought to have had a complete, full, and independent inquiry before some Committee of the House of Commons, and until they got that, and had an opportunity of arguing the matter they would not be satisfied. He wanted to say, in conclusion, that the Board of Trade proposed to give five or six millions more for the docks than they were considered to be worth to the public previous to the Report of the Royal Commission. Some of the shares that they were now going to give 75 for, were quoted then at 19, and previous to that they were quoted at a still lower figure, and probably if they had been put on the market it would have been found that they were not worth anything at all. So far as the public was concerned, it was proposed to give a much larger price for the docks than would have been given previous to that unfortunate Report which had been made so much use of to increase the price of the stock of these companies. He hoped they would get Mr. Cruttwell's Report which he had asked for. Unless the Board of Trade produced it they would not be satisfied that the Board of Trade had got a good case, and they would be entitled to say that their own experts had condemned them. His hon. friend the Member for one of the Hackney divisions, who was a Member of the Committee, had suggested that there was only one corporation which was against the purchase of the docks. All he knew was that the Corporation of the City of London petitioned against purchase of the docks as being wrong and improper, and he could mention other corporations and companies which petitioned in the same sense. It was an unfortunate fact that some people who ought to know better at the present moment had the mad idea of buying everything with other people's money, and paying for it in paper, forgetting that that paper must be honoured by the people of London. When they were told that no money was going to pass, that was only deceiving the public. He had shown that they did not want the docks at all. He had shown that all over the world the development now was, and in the future would be, deep-water jetties and quays. In all up-to-date ports in this and other countries they insisted on these. He found a clause in the Report of the British Consul-General at Antwerp which was important. That official said that it was an undoubted fact that as regarded the saving of time and facility of manœuvring large vessels the verdict was greatly in favour of river quays. That proved that in the one port where they had got docks the traders were all in favour of quays. He would not take up the time of the Committee by reading it, but he just mentioned that he had a long list of the names of between thirty and forty individuals and firms and owners of ships, including Sir Thomas Sutherland, of the P. and O. Line, Sir Alfred Jones, the Allan Line, etc., who were all in favour, so far as the Thames was concerned of jetties and deep-water wharves or quays. He contended that if they were going to spend £23,000,000 on these useless docks, they would have no money left to develop the port as it ought to be developed by means of deep-water jetties and wharves. On the contrary, it would be the duty of the new authority to discourage the competition so far as they could of the wharves and jetties for the purpose of making as good a balance-sheet as they could for the docks. That was bound to happen, and they would find that the new authority would oppose the construction of quays in the interest of the docks. Another point which he wished to make was that the Board of Trade, with their insane idea of the purchase of these docks, used their influence to oppose the construction of deep-water jetties at Long Reach, and the company only got their scheme through by reducing it to a very large extent. The Board of Trade said that the syndicate or company which was going to build the jetties ought to go to Parliament, but the Board of Trade knew that if the syndicate went to Parliament an immense expense would have been incurred to meet the opposition of the dock companies. Fortunately, the Thames Conservancy over-ruled that, and the syndicate had at last got leave to go on constructing deep-water jetties; and near Gravesend, and lower down the river at Thames Haven and other places, every accommodation necessary for the Port of London would be provided in the cheapest and best possible manner, and in a way which would not make the Port of London a dear port. He should like to impress on the present Liberal Government, which had boasted so much of its free trade principles, and which had been put into power on account of them, that they should not support those trusts, companies and speculators which would tax the food of the people of the country for their own selfish ends.

SIR H. KEARLEY: I thought my hon. friend was acquainted with the statement made by the Joint Committee that every investigation made for them should be treated as confidential. I put it to my hon. friend, what sort of position he would feel himself in if he were an owner of property which was going to be investigated with a view to possible purchase, and found that a report of the investigation which was to be treated as confidential was afterwards disclosed? The dock companies themselves had not the Reports. They were got for the information of the Board of Trade, and it would be a gross breach of trust on the part of the Government if they were to reveal their contents.

*MR. MORTON said that all he could say in answer to the hon. Gentleman was that the Board of Trade had no business to make a secret bargain with these dock companies at all; and as they were dealing with public money they ought to have this Report. They thought they came to a right conclusion as to why it was that the Report was kept back.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) pointed out that Government departments like the Board of Trade ought not to have any secret documents in a matter of this kind, and he ventured to submit that the House had a right to have all the information which they had collected presented to them when they were asked to sanction a purchase involving a sum of something over twenty-two millions sterling. They had had nothing from the Secretary to the Board of Trade that justified the House in accepting the statement that these statements were denied to the House because the Reports were confidential. Dealing with the larger question involved in the third clause of the Bill, he could not help thinking that they were asked to consent to this arrangement in the spirit of conceding a triumph to the Chancellor of the Exchequer rather than that of approving of a good bargain. He thought those who had taken part in the debate must have recognised that the Government seemed to realise that they were asking the House to approve of an improvident bargain. The President of the Board of Trade assured the House that the margin over market value could not be more than one or two millions sterling. He ventured to submit that the margin of the large sum which the right hon. Gentleman mentioned was a quite safe sum, and that from his point of view there was not a less margin than that. He quite agreed with all that had been said about the docks they were now asked to purchase being antiquated and not abreast of the times, and that the new authority in taking over the business of the most important port in the world, was doing so on terms which would permanently tie their hands, that they were not provided under this Bill with the money necessary to bring the port up to date, and that in consequence the great port of London would be permanently handicapped. He had no desire to trespass upon the time of the Committee, and he did not wish to support any resolution which would result in the destruction of the Bill. At the same time, he thought he was entitled as a private Member to say that he considered the bargain which they were asked to ratify was an improvident one, and one not best calculated to advance the future prosperity of the Port of London, and that it was a bargain which the House was entitled to consider at greater length, and with greater information from the Government.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith) said he should like to say a few words as a Member of the Joint Committee. He had listened with great interest to the criticisms which had been made upon the Bill, but if the Committee would forgive him for saying so, the Members who had taken part in the debate very largely had started exactly where the Committee started their labours. All these figures and arguments that were now adduced were present in the minds of the Committee, and they being business men, they naturally occurred to their minds. Not a single critic of the bargain had ever been able to suggest anything to put in its place.

MR. MORTON: We say, do not purchase at all.

*SIR WILLIAM BULL said the only alternative was that the Bill should be dropped entirely, the purchase abandoned, and the whole matter abandoned for ten or fifteen years. Nobody pretended that that state of things could go on. They made a brave attempt on their side of the House to settle the difficulty, but they did not succeed. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer was more successful. He went to the docks companies and said in effect—"We have a large majority behind us. I believe we shall be able to carry a Dock Bill if you like to take the terms I offer. You will have a chance of getting your money back and it will be a fair exchange." The dock companies thought the matter over very carefully and terms were arranged. The Chancellor of the Exchequer took, no doubt, a great deal of responsibility on himself in suggesting this novel way, but on the other hand the alternative was arbitration. Look at what they had had in regard to arbitration, not only in the case of the Water Board, but in a similar dock, viz., that of Singapore. The people there expected to get something like £11,000,000, and they got £22,000,000. It was astounding to both vendors and purchasers. A few months ago the tenant was going out of a large house in a West End Square, and wanted £400 for the fixtures. The new tenant said he would only give £200, but the arbitrator gave £605. There were other arguments against arbitration, not only the uncertainty, but the certainty, for it was a curious thing that wherever the public bought public works of this kind they had to pay through the nose. Then there would probably have been a tremendous delay—three or four years - before the arbitration was finished, and in addition there was the expense. Therefore, he thought the Government were very wise in driving as hard a bargain as they could, and buying these docks outright. Hon. Members told them that they need not have troubled about the docks. How could any responsible Government have allowed that to take place? They would literally have starved the docks to death. They came to the conclusion that it was absolutely impossible to leave the docks out when forming a Port authority. They all came to the conclusion that it was impossible to come to any other decision than that the docks would have to be purchased. And suppos-they were not, there would be the question immediately of buying another dock. After all the Port authority would have the best docks in the river. Hon. Members talked about these docks being effete. The London Docks and the St. Catherine's Docks were all in full use, and the short sea traders were using them. It was true that there were only 13½ feet of water over the Thames Tunnel at the time of low tide, but the vessels got up and the docks were built for these ships of a certain size, while the larger docks were down the river, and they had Tilbury for the largest ships of all. An hon. Member had said they would be able to buy land down the river and make docks, but he did not consider the tremendous cost and the tremendous time it would take. Then he had talked about building docks suitable for the largest ships. That was exactly what the London Docks had been doing, but the ships got larger and larger. They had to have larger and deeper docks. He came to the Committee with his mind entirely against the Government, but he listened very carefully and he came to the conclusion that the docks had to be purchased, and that the scheme of the Government was the best one under the circumstances if they were to deal with the docks in the present decade. If the matter went on for ten or fifteen years some other solution would have to come about, but under present circumstances he thought the Government had done well.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said it was just because they did not want to go on for ten or fifteen years that many persons there approved of the Government taking this course. The docks had always been the whole impediment, and they had been standing in the way of the solution or endeavour to reform too long. Who was there objected to it? So far as he knew, the shipowners were not objecting. He did not understand why the London County Council was alleging the slightest objection to what was going to be done. He did not understand that the Corporation of London had passed any vote against it.

*MR. MORTON: May I read the Resolution?

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I do not think these interruptions are at all necessary.

*MR. MORTON: We had better get the facts now than argue it upon false premises. I can read the Resolution.

MR. BARNARD said that, at any rate, he had not heard either of the Members of the City rise in their places and object. The Chamber of Commerce had not said a word against it, and the chairman had spoken in favour of it. As to arbitration, the question there was one of maintainable income. It was necessary to ascertain what was the income that was earned, and how much outlay was necessary to maintain it, to protect it, and to render it possible for it to continue to be earned. Several speakers had alluded to the Water Board, of which he had the privilege of being chairman. They purchased their undertaking through arbitration at a cost of £230,000, the expense of that arbitration, and for four years the Water Board that had paid under that arbitration £47,000,000, or something like it, for the properties they secured, had traded without a deficiency upon the decision arrived at. The accountant who was their adviser in the matter of the Water Board, who looked the whole case up for them, was the accountant who had been advising the Government on this question, and he thought under these circumstances, as the Water Board had been able to trade in the way it had for the last four years, that was sufficient to enable any impartial man to form the opinion that the Government had taken a wise and statesmanlike step. There had seldom been so great an undertaking as the Water Board and these docks, and he heartily applauded the proposals of the Government. He thought it was the best, and he believed it would be the cheapest course, and the sooner the work was got on with the better.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 180; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 376.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, Sir John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.

Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hills, J. W.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morse, L. L.
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tillett, Louis John
Verney, F. W.
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Baldwin, Stanley
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Gardner, Ernest
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
O'Grady, J.
Radford, G. H.
Renwick, George
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Steadman and Mr. Morton.

Clause 12:

MR. RENWICK said he rose for the purpose of moving Amendments the object of which was to exclude goods carried coastwise from the operation of the Bill. There were many and weighty reasons why coastwise goods should be excluded, and he would endeavour as concisely as possible to put those views before the Committee. In the first place, it was somewhat incongruous to describe, as it was described in the Bill, "the export and import of coastwise carried goods." The Customs did not recognise the export and import of goods coastwise. The meaning of export was the sending of goods to other countries, and the meaning of import was the bringing of goods from other countries to this. It had not been the custom of the Customs hitherto to tax goods carried coastwise, yet that was what this clause of the Bill meant to do. It meant that goods carried coastwise were to be taxed. The clause did not say what amount of tax was to be paid on those goods. That was left in a vague way to a Provisional Order to be made hereafter. That was a very serious thing for these goods, because the Committee ought to recognise that goods carried coastwise meant that they were carried in competition with the railways. Low rates were accepted for goods so carried. He had in his own experience known goods carried nearly 700 miles coastwise for about 1s. a ton. If goods were carried that distance at those rates there was no room for any tax upon them. He might be told that it was very easy to collect the tax from the owner of the goods, but it was an absolute impossibility to do so in this case, because owing to the competition of the railways an exceptionally low rate was charged, and the goods were sent in very small parcels, upwards of 1,000 different parcels being sometimes carried in one ship. He did not know any possible machinery by which the dues on those goods could be collected from their owners. If goods were imported from across the sea they had to be reported to the Custom House, and they had to be passed. The manifest had to be handed to the Custom House and the Customs took good care that the dues were collected. When a coastwise ship came into port the Customs did not know what was in that ship. No one knew what was in it but the captain. That showed the difficulty of collecting dues on these goods. If a tax was placed upon goods carried coastwise, what did it mean? It meant that in these times of the combination of railway companies they were going to put them under a disadvantage and play into the hands of the railway companies. If ever there was a time to keep our great waterways open, now was the time, and no tax should be placed upon goods carried by sea which was not put upon goods carried by rail. If goods were sent by rail from Manchester no tax was placed upon them, but if they were sent by water, dues were to be charged upon them. He could understand that the railway companies would be pleased to see these dues placed on goods carried coastwise, but he quite conceived, if the representatives of the great ports were alive to the importance of the matter, that they would support the Amendment he had moved. What the owners of coastwise steamers feared was that, owing to the development of the port—not because of the development of the river, but of the docks—a large amount of money would be wanted, and that the goods they carried would be taxed to find a large proportion of that revenue. It might be news to hon. Members to know that in many cases these steamers did not discharge in the river at all but in the docks. They paid no dock dues, but by arrangement they paid a lump sum for the use of the wharves and warehouses in those docks. They paid no dues and there was no machinery for for the collection of taxes upon the goods they carried. He contended that, if the Committee passed this clause, they would be doing a great injustice to the shipowner who carried his goods coastwise. Owing to the competition of the railway companies, the rates were cut down to the lowest possible point. The coasting ships supplied an alternative route to traders largely to their benefit, yet the proposal of the Bill was to put a tax upon those goods. Supposing the tax was 1s. a ton and 1s. a ton was the rate at which the steamers carried the goods, they were going to put a tax of 100 per cent. on those goods. That was an outrageous proposal. If they were not going to put 1s. a ton tax on the goods, what were they going to propose? Would they propose a limit, because unless a limit were imposed, it would be impossible to contract? There was nothing whatever in the Bill as to what the rate was to be, and he contended that no port could develop its trade if they were going to put even a 20 per cent. tax on the goods carried. He hoped the Committee would hestitate before they allowed any tax to be placed upon goods carried coastwise; but, if they decided that it was necessary to tax the goods, then they ought to have a definite proposal as to what the maximum amount of that tax would be.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 3, to leave out the words 'or coastwise.'"—(*Mr. Renwick.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. CHURCHILL: I hope when we get to a later stage of this Bill very shortly to give my hon. friend some reassurance as to the limit of the dues to be placed upon coastwise goods. I agree it is a necessary part of our case that if the dues, as is intended, are to be insignificant, they must be extended over the whole trade. I think it would be a great pity for us to pick and choose and exempt particular categories of trade altogether from the operation of the exceedingly moderate and almost insignificant dues which will ultimately be levied. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not think that I wish to dispose of the important matter he has raised in a cursory fashion. As a matter of fact, the whole of this subject will be open to be discussed further upon the Provisional Order. I trust, therefore, we may leave the question till the time when the Provisional Order which will be solely concerned with these matters is discussed, and that for the present my hon. friend will be content with the assurance that before the debate proceeds much further I will move an Amendment imposing some top limit upon dues which may be placed upon coastwise and other goods so as to remove that question altogether from the area of anxiety and discussion.

SIR C. CORY (Cornwall, St. Ives) said he was requested by his constituents, most of the traders of whom received their goods coastwise, to support the Amendment. They felt that it was a great hardship that coast steamers should pay dues on the goods they carried in competetition with railway companies. It might ruin many of the coast lines and also make the cost of the carriage on goods dearer. It was some consolation to hear that the President of the Board of Trade would impose a "top" limit, but he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see his way not to levy the dues at all. Otherwise, he certainly thought he ought to levy them on goods carried by railway as well.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 7, after the word 'such,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 10, after the first word 'the' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham) moved to leave out paragraph (*a*), in order to call the attention of the Committee and the Board of Trade to its phrasing. It seemed to him to contain a rather cast-iron description. If they read the wording of the clause they would find that the Port authority were absolutely precluded from charging different port rates in respect of the use of different parts of their premises. It seemed to him rather unreasonable that they should be prevented from charging a different scale of rates for different docks. It might be an advantage to coax trade in an unpopular dock by giving a small concession in rates, and he thought if the Board of Trade gave the Port authority a certain amount of liberty to differentiate in the rates between the different docks it would be an advantage. He would like some assurance on that point, and if the right hon. Gentleman was able to give him an assurance he would be pleased to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 15, to leave out Paragraph (*a*)."—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the word 'different' in line 16, stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHURCHILL: The object of this proviso is to prevent the Port authority from imposing adverse discrimination between, we will say, the trade in the docks and the trade in the river with regard to the levying of dues on goods. I agree with the hon. Gentleman it is not necessary to insist in every respect upon that arbitrary rule. Although no adverse discrimination could be permitted you might give the Port authority power, if they like, to coax a certain part of the trade without prejudice to other ports, by a beneficial adjustment. My hon. friend only put his Amendment on the Paper to-day, and I must consider a little the way in which this can best be given effect to on Report. The wharfingers would be anxious with regard to any alterations of this character, but, if it can be done without prejudice to other interests, I should be glad to incorporate his suggestion in the Bill and give the Port authority an opportunity of giving some advantage which would perhaps involve some slight departure from strict uniformity.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 16, after the word 'different' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 31, after the word 'maximum,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 37, after the word 'maximum,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*Mr. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) moved to add at the end of subsection (2) the following words: "Provided that if at any time it is necessary to raise by means of such rates a larger sum than two hundred thousand pounds in any year, the Port authority shall not be entitled to raise such larger sum except in such manner and from such sources as Parliament shall determine, and it shall be the duty of the Port authority to apply to Parliament for the necessary powers accordingly." He did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Islington in the action he had taken in regard to the rejection of Clause 3, but the right hon. Gentleman had referred to some observations which he made on the Second Reading in which he commented somewhat adversely on the terms of the arrangement that had been made by the Government. Nothing that had since transpired had affected his opinion at all that the financial prospects of the new Port authority were not so brilliant as was represented by the Government. He based his observations, not upon the average of the six years, but upon the last year, and he thought under the peculiar circumstances of this transaction the figures relating to more recent years were really a better guide than those which extended over the six years. When they dealt with the matter from that point of view it was evident that it was very doubtful indeed whether the Port authority, when they came into their work, and especially when they had begun to borrow money for the purpose, would be by any means in so comfortable a position as had been suggested, especially by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. Taking these figures it was perfectly clear, inasmuch as the last year showed profits of something like £27,000 below the average on which this agreement had been based, that it was more likely that there would be a loss upon the transaction than a gain. But especially was that so when they regarded particular circumstances of the year 1907. In that year the trade of the country had gone up to almost extraordinary proportions, and the import and export trade in London was far larger than it had ever been before; £333,000,000 worth of trade came in and went out of the port as against £314,000,000 in the previous year, and the question was whether that improvement would continue in the next year. He was interested but rather astonished to hear from the Parliamentary Secretary that he expected the gains of the dock companies for the present year would turn out as satisfactory as they were expected and would show profits which would be up to the mark of the figures on which this agreement was based. The Board of Trade figures of the last ten months tended to show quite a contrary result. There had been a falling off of over 10 per cent. of the trade of the country, and if this were to happen with regard to the docks and if that were to be reflected in the profits of the dock companies it would show a very considerable falling off below the amount which it was expected would accrue. He only mentioned these figures because they justified the apprehension which was very largely felt outside, and felt by many who represented London constituencies, that after all there might be a very considerable demand at no very distant period upon the new resources from which the Port authority would have to draw its funds. Under this section these resources would be the new dues upon goods. The Port authority would continue to receive the income which had been received by the Thames Conservancy, the dock companies, and others, and in addition would have a certain new revenue which they would raise in the last resort from the dues imposed under this section. He thought this apprehension was not only justifiable under the circumstances, but it was one against which they ought to be very careful to guard themselves. Many of them had felt all through the controversy that it was a very risky experiment to put any dues upon goods in the Port of London at all. So far was that the case that when the former London County Council was dealing with the matter it volunteered not only to give its guarantee so as to ensure a very large saving in the cost of raising new capital, but also offered to contribute as a free gift £2,000,000 for the deepening of the river. They were anxious to avoid the risk of putting on the trade of London anything in the shape of dues upon goods, because no one could foresee what the effect would be. It might be very serious. Trade could be very easily driven away from the port, and there were many trades in London of which they were informed that a very slight increase in the cost of raw material and other things might bring about a removal of the trade. London had to experience very keen competition indeed from two sources. There was, first of all, the competition of other English ports, and, secondly, the competition from foreign ports. With regard to other English ports it had been very noticeable that during the last twenty years the trade of ports which supplied London, such as Southampton, Harwich and Dover, had gone up at a very much larger rate than the trade in London itself. In twenty years the trade of London had increased by 23 per cent. In Harwich, which was every day growing more important for the supply of material and food and other things for London, it had gone up by 70 per cent., and in Southampton it had gone up no less than 100 per cent. There was no doubt that the sea-borne traffic in London did incur very keen competition by the rail-borne traffic from Southampton, Harwich and Dover. The goods brought from these towns would not pay any of these new dues upon goods leviable in the Port of London, and, therefore, it was quite within the bounds of possibility that the already dangerous competition London had to meet from these ports would be accentuated by the imposition of this new taxation. Then the competition from foreign ports was also very keen. That was due chiefly to the fact that foreign ports had been subsidised by their Governments or their municipalities so that they were able to provide accommodation without putting an undue burden upon the traders who used them. That was the reason why the former London County Council had been willing to bring the financial resources of the rates of London to help the port in the same way as Antwerp was helped by the Municipality and by the State. It might be that the increased amount of money which would be required to be raised from dues on goods was so great that it would be better for the people of London to put the balance upon the rates of London rather than to increase the dues on goods and thereby possibly endanger the trade. It was far more important to Londoners that the trade of the port should be maintained, even at the cost of contributing either in the shape of rates or taxes or in some other way. This was the reason why he submitted the Amendment. It proposed that there should be a limit placed upon the Amendment which could be raised in the shape of dues on goods, and if that limit was exceeded the Amendment proposed that Parliament should be again asked by the port authority to consider, not merely whether they would increase the maximum rates of charge on goods, but whether they could not find other sources from which the money could be obtained for carrying on the port. The Bill provided that the Port authority, with the consent of the Board of Trade, should at any time be able to approach Parliament by means of Provisional Order for the purpose of altering its rates, but that, in his opinion, was not exactly what they wanted. What they wanted was that Parliament should reconsider the whole question if ever the necessities of the case arose. He had suggested that the limit should be £200,000 a year. That figure was arrived at by reason of the evidence given by the representatives of the Board of Trade to the effect that if this agreement was carried out, and if the new Port authority had to borrow £4,200,000, it might require to raise from dues on goods a sum not exceeding £180,000. Under the Amendment as proposed there would be an obligation on the Port authority to obtain new powers if the limit was exceeded, and Parliament would have the option of deciding where the money should come from. He felt certain that if this was agreed to it would set at rest a great deal of very legitimate and justifiable apprehension in the trading community in London, and he had some hope from what the President said that this Amendment, or one in some slightly altered form, might be acceptable to the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 3, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that if at any time it is necessary to raise by means of such rates a larger sum than two hundred thousand pounds in any year, the port authority shall not be entitled to raise such larger sum except in such manner and from such sources as Parliament shall determine, and it shall be the duty of the port authority to apply to Parliament for the necessary powers accordingly.' "—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Mr. Dickinson.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: There is no risk whatever, in my opinion, of the dues imposed on goods in pursuance of this Act creating any appreciable burden upon the trade and prosperity of the Port of London. At the same time, I think the Amenment of my hon. friend raises a point of substance, and I am anxious on behalf of the Government to give it all possible consideration. I recognise that outside this House some apprehension may have been created in the minds of consumers and traders by the mere repetition of the phrase "dues on goods" from the feeling that they might rise to an almost unlimited extent, and there is no sort of accurate appreciation of the insignificant scale of dues contemplated by the Bill. The Committee will be surprised to learn that the maximum dues contemplated to carry out the machinery of the Port of London Bill are not 10 per cent.—they are not 1 per cent.—they are at the very outside less than one-tenth per cent. of the value of the whole volume of trade of the Port. As the matter of fact, the percentage is less than one farthing in the £ or 2s. in the £100 to meet the requirements of the whole Port of London and to raise the amount necessary to carry out this Bill. Therefore I do not think any serious apprehension need be felt. It is quite true that the dues need not necessarily be imposed over the whole area. There would be power to vary and modify dues so as to make them adapted to each class of trade, and that is a discretion which, in my opinion, does not make it worse, but better, because it is to their interest to cater for trade and custom and modify their dues within the exact limits necessary to secure the prosperity of the port upon which their own success absolutely depends. I do not like the actual wording of the Amendment of my hon. friend, because I think £200,000 is a limit which might unduly impair the security for the great financial operation which is the centrepiece of the Bill. We must remember that the financial operation is a bargain settled by agreement, and the security for the execution of it is in part the power of levying dues on goods. The Board of Trade take power to screw up the dues on goods to the level when the financial obligations of the bargain shall have been satisfactorily discharged. Therefore I think £200,000 would be too narrow a limit, although I should very much doubt whether it would ever be reached in practice. I have considered how I could allay the apprehension of my hon. friend and others, and I think I can insert into the Bill a provision that the dues on goods should never exceed a thousandth part by value of the trade of the Port of London without recourse being had to Parliament. It is a very simple calculation, and if my hon. friend will withdraw his Amendment I shall be glad to move to add at the same point where he proposes to insert his Amendment, the following words—"If in each of two successive years the aggregate amount received from port rates on goods exceeds one-thousandth part of the aggregate value of the goods imported into and exported from the Port of London in that year, it shall be the duty of the Port authority to take the necessary steps to prevent a continuance of the excess, including, if necessary, an application to Parliament to provide them with further means to meet their financial obligations." In choosing the expression "one-thousandth part" I have endeavoured to select a phrase which will most easily and most popularly allay apprehension to the outside public who are not able to study the details of this Bill.

*MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton) said he was glad to hear the statement of the President of the Board of Trade on this important point. He regretted somewhat the exact form in which the official Amendment had been put down, because it would appear that excessive expenditure beyond the proposed limit might continue for two years before any steps were taken to remedy the misfortune. Nevertheless, he believed that in proposing this Amendment to the Committee the hon. Gentleman had dealt with what had been hitherto probably the most serious blot upon the whole Bill. The object of the Bill was to provide a certain amount of money for the improvement of the Port of London, to improve the channel and the dock accommodation for the benefit of all the interests which were congregated in that port. The principle of the Bill was to secure from the payers of dues on goods almost the entire amount which was necessary for these improvements. The shipowners contributed a small portion of the necessary additional revenue by a method of levelling up tonnage dues in one dock to the level of the dues which exist now in the other two docks, and the owners of barges contributed an insignificant sum in the form of the registration fees on barges. But apart from these sources of revenue the entire revenue was derived from the payers of dues. This was a very serious matter in the event of any possible mismanagement or incompetence on the part of the Port authority, and in the event of the financial arrangement between the Government and the dock companies proving less advantageous than the Government expected. He was bound to say that he thought it rather characteristic of the House that this matter, the interest of the traders of the Port of London, was the very last interest which received the consideration of the House. The interests of the shipowners had been as they always were in all matters of legislation most carefully and sympathetically considered; the interests of the wharfingers were considered as well as those of the riverside manufacturers. Even the owners of dock stock and the future owners of port stock had receiven the most generous and sympathetic consideration from the Government, but it was quite in accordance with the usual practice that the very last interest which came before the House for generous consideration was that of the traders of the Port of London. He was surprised that the Committee upon the Bill did not appear to recognise the necessity of doing something to safeguard that great interest, and he was indebted to the hon. Member for St. Pancras for having placed this Amendment on the Paper. He was glad that the Government had accepted the principle of the Amendment.

Amendment to proposed Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, after the word 'goods,' to insert the words 'to and from parts beyond the sea.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 16, line 7, after the word 'such,' to insert the word 'port.'"

"In page 16, line 10, after the first word 'the,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

AN HON. MEMBER said he was asked by his constituents to move to omit subsection (4).

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, subsection 4 to be omitted."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to 'them' in line 42, stand part of the clause.

SIR H. KEARLEY: The object of the subsection is to prevent evasions of the payment of port dues which may be practised under certain conditions. For example, it is quite possible for a cargo of coal to come to the Medway and get exemption from the Port of London dues; and that the ship should then turn round in the Medway and come up to London without paying the dues.

AN HON. MEMBER said that the ports down the river were outside the London area and ought to be exempted from the payment of port dues. Why should not coasting vessels going to the Medway take goods to any other ports without paying dues? It seemed to him very desirable to encourage the coasting trade, because it gave employment to seamen who were a very valuable asset to the Navy.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 17, line 5, after the second word 'of,' to insert the word 'port.'"

"In page 17, line 11, after the word 'any,' to insert the word 'port.'"

"In page 17, line 42, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'port.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. HOLT said that the formidable subsection which stood on the Paper in his name and which he now proposed was copied *verbatim*, except for the necessary alteration, from the clause in the Mersey Dock Act, under which the dues on coastwise cargoes were collected. The object was to enable the Port authority to enter into an arrangement with the owners or masters of coasting vessels to compound for their dues instead of collecting them on each separate ship as she came into port. The whole coasting trade of Liverpool was carried on under this clause. The Member for Newcastle had spoken of the difficulties in the collection of dues on coasting vessels; and he agreed with him, unless some power was given to the Port authority to enter into an arrangement such as was suggested in the Amendment. He understood that the Board of Trade had not had yet time to consider the Amendment; and if he had an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that it would be considered, he would be very glad to withdraw it in the meantime. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 18, line 5, at the end, to add the words '(5) The Port authority on the one hand and any owner or master of or agent for any vessel in the coastwise or short sea trade to or from the Port of London, or any person or person interested in goods, merchandise, or cargo carried by any such vessel on the other hand, may from time to time enter into and carry into effect, vary, and rescind agreements or arrangements with respect to the mode of calculation or payment, or the time of payment, of rates payable to the port authority in respect of all or any goods, merchanise, articles, or things forming the cargo, or part of the cargo, of any such vessel. Provided always, that in case the Port authority shall at any time make any such agreement the owner or master of or agent for any vessel engaged in like manner, or any person interested in goods, merchanise, or cargo carried by any such vessel, shall be entitled, the circumstances being the same, to require the Port Authority to enter into a like agreement or arrangement with him or them upon the same terms, to the intent that no agreement shall be made by the port authority under this provision partially or in favour of any particular person, vessel, or cargo.' "—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. CHURCHILL said that this was an Amendment which looked formidable, but was either rather innocent or very wicked. It proposed to give power to traders to compound for their dues by paying in advance to the Port Authority a certain sum, and then at the end of the year, if the account was overdrawn by so much, the difference was made good, or if it was underdrawn, the difference was carried to the credit of the trader. He believed that a discretionary power which would enable the Port Authority to enter into such an arrangement might be very useful. But, if the compounding was to be made by traders on a large scale, and no repayment of the balance was to be made at the end of the year, it might be made the ground of an undue preferential advantage being given, which was a great cause of anxiety in any port, but still more in the port of London, where the river and the docks were to some extent antagonistic. He understood from his hon. friend that what he wished to do was to take an innocent and not a wicked course. His own impression was that the Port Authority could already under the Bill do what was desired, but if they could not, some words could be adopted later so as to give effect to the very useful and innocent procedure suggested.

MR. HOLT said that after that declaration by the right hon. Gentleman he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question proposed, "That the Clause as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. LOUGH wished to osk the right hon. Gentleman a question with regard to the trans-shipment of goods imported into the Port of London for trans-shipment and not charged dues. He wanted to ask the right hon. Gentleman how much he meant by "trans-shipment." He was sure that the Secretary to the Board of Trade knew what a mighty trade the Port of London did on a very narrow basis in trans-shipment—in importing goods from foreign parts, and especially from British Colonies, which were almost immediately exported to other parts of the world. If those goods had to pay both import dues when they came in and export dues when they went out, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman, however small he made the charge, he would strike a great blow at this trade of trans-shipment and transfer it to some cheaper port. In the Amendment he aimed at goods being exempted from dues if trans-shipped within three months after their arrival at the Port of London. But he was not wedded to three months; one month would do, or any definition of trans shipment which would cover distribution from the Port of London, especially of Colonial goods, and not interfere with the great trade done under that head. Although merchants and brokers might be interested to a large extent in this business, yet there was a greater British interest involved in it; he meant the great shipping interest. Take the case of tea importation. The tea came almost entirely from India and Ceylon. A very large amount of it was brought to London in order to be sent on to the United States, Canada, and Russia. He recognised that in subsection (*b*) of the clause an endeavour had been made on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to avoid the difficulties on this question of dues on goods which arose from the definition of trans-shipment being too narrow. That was the only question he had to raise, and he would be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman could assure them that some liberal interpretation would be put upon the word "trans-shipment" so that this great and important industry would not be injured.

SIR H. KEARLEY: There are certain cases about which there are no difficulties; they are purely trans-shipment cases. Goods are brought to a port on an optional bill of lading which gives the owner of them the opportunity of making up his mind before the ship arrives whether he will trans-ship them on arrival to Newfoundland or elsewhere where there is a particular merchant who happens to want the goods. That is what we mean by a trans-shipment case in the ordinary sense, and that is capable of definition. That is pure trans-shipment, but what my right hon. friend wants is something more extensive, and he wants us to declare it on the face of the Bill. We cannot meet him in that particular. My right hon. friend wants the exemption to apply to goods which have been moved to any quay, wharf, jetty, or warehouse, and are exported in the same condition in which they have been imported within three months after their arrival in the Port of London. He wants that to be declared to be trans-shipment. Let me take as an illustration. A merchant in London has practically no Colonial or American connection for certain goods, but three months after he has obtained a consignment he receives a casual export order and he sends the goods. My hon. friend says that is trans-shipment, but I do not think it is. I do not judge the case at all as to whether that particular parcel of goods should get a rebate, because it would have paid the duties in coming in three months ago. Probably it should be recoverable, but the only persons who are capable of deciding that are those upon whom will be cast the responsibility of drawing up the Schedule, which it is provided that the Port Authority shall submit to the Board of Trade. No doubt the clause gives an authorisation that it shall be settled, but as far as we are able at the moment to see, it would be highly dangerous for us to endeavour to extend it beyond the words of the Bill.

MR. LOUGH: What words?

SIR H. KEARLEY: If my hon. friend refers to the proviso in Clause 12 (*b*) he will see that it applies to cases of goods sent here for trans-shipment only. That is a tight definition which the Port authority may draw, but the words "or which remain on board the ship in which they were imported for conveyance therein to another port" leave it more elastic and open. I hope my right hon. friend is satisfied with that explanation which I gave before the

Committee upstairs and will not press us for a definition. I do not think it is possible to do it. I should like to see someone do it, and I should like to see my right hon. friend draw up a definition.

MR. LOUGH said his hon. friend had shown a sympathetic disposition. He admitted that he had raised a good point, and told him that some effort would be made by the people who drew up the Schedule to meet it. Therefore, he would not press the matter any further.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13, 14 and 15 agreed to.

Clause 16:

MR. LOUGH said that here again he did not want to trouble the right hon. Gentleman, but he would like a little explanation and he hoped he would give it to him in the same sympathetic spirit as he extended to him a moment ago. He did not know what the latter part of this clause was about, but as far as he could make out generally from the clause it appeared that one of these small dock companies, which the right hon. Gentleman had brought under Clause 3, might have purchased a house and not been able to pay for it and given a sort of security. If they did not pay the interest the person from whom they bought it might, under the mortgage, resume possession. The object of the clause was to reserve the right of such seller against the Port authority. He thought it a pity that a clause of this sort should be thought necessary. Surely the credit of the Port authority would be much better than that of the small authority which they had bought up, and would it not be better if the clause ended at the point where his Amendment came in and to leave the moneys secured on the Port fund. His object was to ask for some explanation. This seemed to him to be one of those unnecessary and humiliating restrictions which the Board of Trade had imposed upon the Port authority. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 19, line 11, to leave out from beginning of line to end of subsection."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. CHURCHILL: So far from being a humiliating restriction proposed by the Board of Trade on the Port authority this is a definite liberty granted by the Board of Trade to the Port authority. The Port authority will be in possession of the property of several people who are now in business, and will take over their assets and their liabilities, and this clause will give the new authority a definite power to pay off those liabilities by coming to some arrangement with some of their small outstanding creditors, or mortgage holders, to issue port stock privately instead of having to go to the open market and pay them off in the ordinary way. I am advised that that will produce economy. It is merely a permissive authority to the Port authority to discharge its liabilities.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 17:

MR. FELL moved to add to the purpose for which the Port authority may borrow money that of "constructing a lock or locks across the river bed." This, he said, was in pursuance of a power obtained under Clause 2 of the Bill upon which the right hon. Gentleman agreed that under the powers given to the Port authority for construction they should have power to construct locks. As a sequence to that it was necessary that they should have power to borrow money to construct a lock or locks. It might be that the words of the Bill were sufficiently wide to cover this, but as he thought that was doubtful he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 1, at end, to insert the words 'constructing a lock or locks across the river bed.'"—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: When the hon. Gentleman moved earlier in the Bill to insert the words "lock or locks," I agreed that the words might be an improvement to the Bill. But whereas the words moved then was an improvement these words if inserted here would be a restriction. We are not here dealing with specific works. What we are dealing with now are general works, and if we were to insert the word "locks" here I am informed that, owing to the intricacies of the law, it would be held to be a presumption against other works not stated in the Bill. It would not add to the freedom of the Port authority to construct locks, but would spoil the drafting of the Bill and would have the definite effect of narrowing its scope.

MR. FELL said the last thing that he wished to do was to restrict the power of the Port authority, and it was with the object of making the matter clear that he moved this Amendment. He had seen so many unfortunate things happen owing to the omission of words from Acts of Parliament. If the right hon. Gentleman told him that the effect of this Amendment would be to restrict the powers of the Port authority he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 18:

MR. LOUGH moved to leave out paragraph (*a*), which, he said, meant that if any holder of port stock of any kind of the value of not less than £500,000 in respect to the interest on which the Port authority had made default for a period of not less than three months would be able to get a receiver appointed against the Port authority. That was a very humiliating restriction. Surely the Port authority should have better credit than to have a Receiver appointed against them if a trifling incident occurred and the interest could not be paid for three months. That was the sort of thing that might happen any day in a great body like this, working a very great business. He really thought that the people who had a claim for interest against the Port authority ought to be satisfied without this. He believed this particular clause was put in at the request of the dock company. It was not drawn by the Board of Trade, but the greedy dock companies who were not satisfied with the high price they had got for the docks. Not content with the dues on goods, imposed by the right hon. Gentleman on their behalf, they wanted the right to put a receiver in if the interest was overdue. No Member present got his interest up to date and he did not see why the dock companies should. This was a paragraph that should be struck out. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 21, line 38, to leave out paragraph (*a*)."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHURCHILL: No one could possibly quarrel with my right hon. friend because he is in opposition to our measure, because he expresses himself so pleasantly that his opposition is almost more satisfactory than his support. I must say in this case I think my right hon. friend has convinced the Committee that very little answer from me is necessary on this point. We have to consider the possibility of these great financial operations, involving £22,000,000, and we are trying to prop up the security in every way we can. The more the port stock is propped up the cheaper it will be for the authority to borrow for any undertaking in the future. When we are told by my right hon. friend it would not be a serious thing for a great authority like this to be three months in arrear with its legal obligations to its stockholders, I must say I think my right hon. friend takes an unduly lax view of the punctilious regard for financial obligations which always characterises the business men of this country.

Sir F. BANBURY had no desire to intervene in a domestic quarrel, but he reminded the right hon. Gentleman that the right hon. Member for Islington had compared the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a fraudulent mine promoter earlier in the afternoon, a comparison, much as he disagreed with the right hon. Gentleman, he himself would not have dared to make. He was glad the President of the Board of Trade did not think there was much in that. The right hon. Member for Islington had evidently not read this clause when he stated that a receiver was to be appointed if the interest was in arrear for two or three days, because the clause said three months, which was a very different thing. Inasmuch as the Port authority would consist in a great degree of the people who used the docks and to whose interest it would be to obtain as small charges as possible for goods entering the docks, this was the least that could be done if the Government desired to keep up the security of the Port authority, which it was essential to do if fresh money was to be borrowed for other matters. Under these circumstances, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would withdraw his Amendment.

*Mr. MORTON did not see that this clause was necessary in any way. Directly the Port authority had bought the docks, it did not matter whether the price of port stock went up or down. This was a condition made by the dock companies, and that was why it was put into the Bill. Whatever might be the market value of this stock they would be perfectly secure. It would not affect the Port authority at all. Nor did he think it would affect the borrowing of fresh capital. He did not see how this was to prop up the port stock very much. He thought it was a sign of weakness on the part of the Government. They were right to allow it to go in, because they had no faith in their own scheme, and therefore had taken power to put the broker in by-and-bye, and get money from anybody and anyone to pay for the docks.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. LOUGH moved to leave out subsection (5). This was a very important Amendment, although he did not propose to press it if he got a satisfactory answer from the right hon.

Gentleman. The Committee were in a very remarkable position so far as this Bill was concerned. The Opposition took no intelligent interest in it whatsoever. But this matter was of great interest, and he hoped the Committee would tolerate those on the Ministerial side of the House who took an interest in it. This was a most important clause. He did not quite understand what it meant himself. If it meant that the Port authority should not be allowed to borrow any money in excess of £5,000,000 apart from that coming from the docks, it was an undue restriction. According to the Report of the Royal Commission, £4,500,000 or £5,000,000 would be required for the docks alone. Those who had listened to his remarks earlier in the evening would remember that he attached great importance to the deepening of the river. Was the whole of the expenditure of the new Port authority to be confined to buying the docks, in the first place, and in the second putting those wretched places in order? Surely a further £2,000,000 or £4,000,000 should be allowed for deepening the river for those ships that would come up. This was a great restriction if it meant that no money was to be left for that purpose, and that the whole of it must be absorbed in buying and repairing the docks. He did not think this section was a fair one. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 18, to leave out subsection 5."—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*MR. CHURCHILL: I am in agreement with my right hon. friend in considering the £5,000,000 an exceedingly moderate amount to borrow, having regard to the large works this authority will undertake in buying and improving the docks. But my right hon. friend will agree with me that there must, at least, be some restriction. I also think it must be remembered that before we added to the limitation of the amount that might be raised on loan it was very necessary to have a recurring check on new borrowings without having recourse to Parliament. But if it is the feeling that a little more latitude may be given in this respect—if the right hon. Gentleman expresses the general opinion of the Committee in this matter—I shall be very glad to leave it to the Committee. But I will not take upon myself the responsibility for extension. We have fixed £5,000,000, I am content with that. If the Committee likes to give more latitude and presses this Amendment to a division, I shall certainly not oppose it.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said the right hon. Gentleman in this matter had lost sight of the fact that the Thames Conservancy had put forward a Bill to double their dues on ships to enable them to deepen the river. Under this Bill the power of the Thames Conservancy was extended. Therefore he thought there was no necessity here for an increased fund.

MR. HOLT urged the Government before they accepted the Amendment to consider what the effect on the Port authority would be: £5,000,000 was a very good sum to raise on the security of the Port authority. They should start with great confidence in them, and everyone would be sure that the Board of Trade would find the best possible means to manage them. But this was an absolutely untried institution. It had no record behind it, and it seemed to him that if they gave unlimited borrowing power to an authority which had not been tried and had no record behind it they would have much less credit and be able to borrow money on less favourable terms than if they had a borrowing power of a more restricted character.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the Committee has expressed its opinion, and if my right hon. friend presses this Amendment to a division, he will not obtain much support. I myself do not object and I showed some inclination to follow his lead, but I am afraid we should be a very small party. That being so, I strongly recommend my right hon. friend not to tempt fortune in the division lobby.

*MR. MORTON hoped the Committee would not agree to any such extension. It would be a very good thing if the

Port authority had to come to Parliament when they wanted to borrow more money. It would give the House an opportunity of considering whether they were going on all right or not. The Committee must not forget that the repayment of these loans would be a tax on the food of the people; therefore Parliament should have every opportunity of considering the matter before they went beyond the £5,000,000 limit. So far as the dredging of the river was concerned, it was possible that if the double tonnage dues were continued, there would be sufficient funds to carry out the whole of the work that could be carried out on the river at present. £400,000 was being spent now to give 30 feet at low water up to Gravesend, and if the double dues were continued there would be enough money to do all the dredging it was possible to do.

Mr. LOUGH was glad to be able to respond to the appeal the right hon. Gentleman had made in such a sympathetic spirit. In reply to the hon. Member for Liverpool, he might say he would not object to a £7,000,000 limit. He did not wish to do away with all restrictions, but he saw his friends who opposed this proposal wanted additional cost thrown on the authority. Under the circumstances he would relieve his right hon. friend from the humiliation of going into the lobby.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 19, 20, and 21 agreed to.

Clause 22:

Mr. LOUGH moved to omit subsection (2). He did not know whether on this Amendment he would receive any support or not, but these little Amendments which did not keep the Committee very long proved at all events that he had read and studied the Bill. This clause was to provide that the Board of Trade should have an estimate of the receipts and expenditure of the Port authority during the financial year "whether on account of property, dues, loans, or otherwise." He agreed with that, and there was nothing in his Amendment which went against it. But under subsection (2) the Board of Trade might demand that there should not only be an estimate every year, but every half year or even a shorter period. That was rather an unnecessary restriction, and it would throw unnecessary cost on the Port authority. Every object would be secured if an estimate was given every year. The subsection (2) said—

"If the Board of Trade are satisfied that the receipts of the port authority on revenue account in any year are likely to be insufficient to meet the charges payable out of revenue in that year, or that the receipts of the port authority on revenue account in the last preceding year were insufficient to pay the charges payable out of revenue in that year, they may make an order," etc.

How could the Board of Trade be satisfied? It simply meant that any gossip might go down to the Board of Trade and say: "Have you got your eye on the Port authority?" Was the Board of Trade to be at the mercy of any gossip? If the right hon. Gentleman could make a sympathetic answer on this point, he would not impede the progress of the Bill; but this was a most restrictive section, and he did not know on what it rested. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 3, to leave out subsection (2)."—(*Mr. Lough*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. CHURCHILL: I agree with my right hon. friend that this particular provision comes into the category of restrictive clauses, but I do not think it does much harm. I do not think the Board of Trade would act upon it, and if they were to act upon it on such very insufficient grounds as the right hon. Gentleman indicated, my faith in the House of Commons is such that I believe they would not fail to see that these conditions should not be used in any unnecessary or vexatious manner. But it does seem to me clear, having regard to the great responsibility with which the Board of Trade is charged in this Port of London Bill, that we should not be compelled to sit still and fold our hands, but that we should have power if necessary to move the Port authority to discharge ordinary obligations. It is part of the general financial structure of the Bill on which the bargain rests, and I certainly do not feel able at this stage to put it away or withdraw it, because it might derange the whole fabric of our financial arrangements. Therefore I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not dwell too much on the very cautious and elaborately circumspect character of the provision, but will recognise that it will be worked in a perfectly satisfactory and businesslike spirit.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said that, having regard to the extraordinary purchase proposals which were referred to in the earlier part of the Bill, it was not to be wondered at that the right hon. Gentleman should have provided that in certain contingencies the whole concern should be handed over to the receiver in the interests of the shareholders. He was not surprised that in order to make both ends meet the Board of Trade were taking power to compel the Port authority to increase its dues should that contingency arise. In his opinion the contingency of the Port authority's being unable to meet its expenditure and finding itself in the hands of the receiver was by no means a remote one. Having regard to the whole structure of the Bill, he did not think the speeches that had been made from the Treasury bench in regard to these and other matters would allay the grave anxiety felt by business men in London in regard to the whole of the provisions of the Bill. The hon. Member for Limehouse told them he was going to support the purchase clause, and he congratulated the Government upon getting his support, because he placed the estimated deficiency at from £100,000 to £200,000 per annum. That being the case, he condoled with the Government on having charge of a measure of this sort which was to set up an authority not unlikely in their own opinion to come into the hands of the Receiver and which was not likely to pay the interest on its stock. In these circumstances the future of the Port of London was a matter of the gravest apprehension, because if dock dues had to be increased, London at once would become a dearer port, and the whole object of this Bill, which was to make the Port of London cheaper and more convenient for shipping, would have failed, and the end would be worse than the beginning. If this clause indicated the real apprehension of the Government, he hoped it was not too late to reconsider the whole business and consider whether it would not be better to drift on as they were doing rather than set up a concern which was expected to gravitate towards bankruptcy.

*MR. MORTON said the Port authority under this Bill would be placed in such a humiliating position that they could neither move nor turn without the consent of the Board of Trade. It had been proved by experience that they got the best boards and less liability to corruption when they made them as independent as possible. He supposed this sub-clause was put in to make the dock companies' stock secure against all comers. He supposed the right hon. Gentleman had been ordered to put this provision in by the dock companies, and therefore it was no use objecting.

MR. LOUGH asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 23:

MR. LOUGH said the object of the Amendment he wished to move was to secure that the receipts for goods discharged or taken on board ship in the river should be kept separate from those receipts for goods discharged or taken on board in the docks. He had some reason to believe that the right hon. Gentleman would accept this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, line 28, at the end to insert the words 'Provided also that all receipts in respect of goods discharged or taken on board in the river shall be shown separately from the receipts from vessels which enter docks.'"—(*Mr. Lough.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: The Government are willing to accept this Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 24 and 25 agreed to.

Clause 26:

*MR. SEAVERNS said his Amendment dealt with a dull and an uninteresting point, but it was nevertheless a matter of the greatest possible interest to the payers of dues in the Port of London, because a right of appeal to the Board of Trade in the case of oppressive action or of reasonable complaint as to the mode in which the Port authority's business was done was given in regard to the charges levied. This right of appeal was rendered far more necessary by the provisions of the Bill, because hitherto the traders of the Port of London had in some instances been able to put one dock company in competition with another whereas in the future they would be in the position of being obliged to deal with an amalgamation of the dock companies. This Amendment had been drafted by the London section of the Timber Trade Federation of the United Kingdom, the Section being a very large contributor to the revenue of the new Port authority. Something like 50 per cent. of their imports were delivered in the docks and payed large charges for landing, warehousing, and storing. The same reason which had led this federation to press for this Amendment applied with equal force to many other trades in London, including the flour and coal trades. The Amendment he had put on the Paper provided that there might be a complaint to the Board of Trade not only when the Port authority was acting in a manner which was unfair and oppressive, but also when there was reason to complain of the mode in which they carried on their dock or warehousing business, or of the charges made in respect thereof, whether levied directly or indirectly, or whether under the maximum or not. Many of the charges levied by the dock companies were not statutory charges at all. He had an account from the Surrey Commercial Dock Company covering charges amounting to £176, and out of that only £129 represented statutory charges, the remaining portion representing charges which might be perfectly legitimate so far as the dock company was concerned, but for which there was no provision in the statute and which he thought were accurately described as indirect charges. With regard to the timber trade, there was one form of indirect charge which was very oppressive to that trade, and it was that the dock companies were in the habit of charging rent upon the timber from the time the bulk was broken, and this placed upon the importer of timber a heavy additional charge which was not statutory and which was not itemised in the accounts. Those were the reasons why it was thought necessary to press for the addition of the words "directly or indirectly." The suggestion that the charges might be complained against, whether under the maximum or not, was due to a fact which was well known to everyone who had daily connection with the trade of the port, viz., that for many years past there had been constant, invariable, and very annoying friction between the importers of goods and the dock authorities, and it was desired by making the wording of this Amendment very clear and explicit that it should be laid down beyond all doubt or question that importers should have a right of complaint where the charges were within the maximum or above the maximum. If this liberty was not accorded it might very well be that the maximum charges of to-day would be stereotyped, and the last state of the importers would be far worse than the first. He would like to point out that the wording adopted in this Amendment had a very strong precedent in Section 1 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, of 1894. He was sure the President of the Board of Trade was fully acquainted with that section, which expressly provided for exactly such cases as were intended to be covered by the Amendment, and it employed the words "directly or indirectly" in the same sense. He felt that the Amendment merely put in clear and explicit terms what he believed was the desire and intention of the Government in this matter. It was a very important point in the minds of many traders in the Port of London, and he pressed the Government most earnestly to adopt it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 4, after the word 'business,' to insert the words 'or of the charges made in respect thereof, whether levied directly or indirectly, and whether under the maximum or not.' "—(*Mr. Seaverns.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: I am inclined to think that the essential part of this Amendment is already provided for in the clause which enables complaints to be made to the Board of Trade in the event of the mode in which the Port authority carry on their dock or warehousing business being unfairly oppressive. They are very general words, and it is very probable that they include what the hon. Member for Brixton desires. I shall be very glad to meet my hon. friend if I can.

*MR. SEAVERNS: We are advised that the words of the clause do not cover my point.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am desirous of meeting my hon. friend, but I am afraid his words are too wide in their meaning, and I cannot accept his actual words. The hon. Member for South Islington has given notice of an Amendment after the word "business" to insert "including charges made in respect of such business." I think those words meet the point of the hon. Member for Brixton, and in some respects they go further than his Amendment.

*MR. SEAVERNS appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to add the words "directly or indirectly." He had already explained to the Committee why he asked for those words to be inserted, and the entire object of his Amendment was to allow this right of appeal.

MR. CHURCHILL: I could not possibly accept those words, because they are far too wide.

MR. SEAVERNS asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 4, after the word 'business,' to insert the words 'including charges made in respect of such business.' "—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. CHURCHILL: The next Amendment I have to move deals with complaints which may be made against the Port authority in cases where there is any increase in charges as compared with the charges existing at the passing of the Act or in regard to the way the authority carries on its warehousing business. We have had representations from various trading associations that some of the existing charges press unduly upon them, and we have endeavoured to meet the views of those organisations and associations. I have every reason to believe that the Amendment will largely meet their views. The lowering of charges to one particular trade very often prejudices other interests. For example, the wharfingers might think their business was being affected seriously or undercut if this lowering of the charges were to take place, and the result of the lowering of the rates under this section might lead to a lot of aggrieved parties asking for an opportunity of being heard.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 14, to leave out from the word 'complaint' to the word 'to,' in line 15, and to insert the words 'is made on behalf of a trade or a section of a trade by the London Chamber of Commerce or any other representative association interested in the trade of the Port of London or relates.' "—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. WILES: What does "representative association" mean?

*SIR A. SPICER: Would not the right hon. Gentleman accept the Amendment standing in the name of the Member for Islington instead of his own? It is the one which meets with the approval of many of the trades, and I would beg him to accept it.

Mr. LOUGH: I think the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman is a good one, but I would suggest that it should be so altered that complaints might be made to the Board of Trade "by any person" as well as on behalf of a trade. Why should a person who is aggrieved and who wishes to appeal to the Board of Trade have to go to a Chamber of Commerce or any other association unless he likes to do so? Why should he not have the right of appealing individually. He might be establishing a new business or have some interest in regard to which he did not wish to court publicity, and I do not see why the individual should not be as completely protected as an association. I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should introduce into his own Amendment after the word "made" the words "by any person." I think that would be a great improvement.

Mr. SEAVERNS: May I say I hope the Government will maintain their own Amendment instead of that in the name of the hon. Member for Islington? I think it would be difficult and awkward to require a body or an institution to go first to the Board of Trade and secure a certificate. I think that would lead to absurdity of procedure.

***Mr. MORTON**: Who is to decide what is meant by "any other representative association interested in the trade of the Port of London?" I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman to kindly explain that.

Mr. LOUGH: I want to move to amend the Amendment by inserting after the word "made" the words "by any person or."

Mr. CHURCHILL: I cannot accept the word "person," I think we must be very careful in this matter. I think the complaint ought to come from a recognised responsible trade, a trade association, or the London Chamber of Commerce.

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) hoped the Board of Trade would not be too ready to accept the words suggested by his hon. friend the Member for Islington. It seemed to him that the Board of Trade should issue a certificate authorising certain bodies to make complaints under proper conditions. He hoped the President of the Board of Trade would consider the form of words which should be inserted without committing himself to-night to the form on the Paper. He did not say what the form of words should be. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman could bring up an Amendment on the Report Stage which would meet the case. There was no precedent in any Statute so far as he was aware for what was now proposed to be done. [Cries of "Yes."]

Mr. CHURCHILL said he was informed that these words were not infrequently inserted. Of course, he agreed that the charges ought not to be very great. There was very little difference between the two Amendments, but he was advised that it would not be objectionable to introduce those few words in the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"After the words 'Port of London' to insert the words 'which obtains a certificate from the Board of Trade that it is a proper body to make such complaint.'"—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 28, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'as compared with the charges existing at the passing of this Act.'"—(*Mr. Wiles.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 18, after the word 'fit,' to insert the words 'after giving any persons appearing to the Board of Trade to be interested an opportunity of being heard.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 27:

*MR. CARR-GOMM moved to insert, after the word "labour," the words "and that no such offices, waiting-rooms, or employment registers, shall be established and maintained inside the area of the dock premises." He did so in order to raise a very important point as to the access to these offices, waiting-rooms, or employment registers. He asked the Government to make it clear to the Committee that there was nothing in this clause which would prevent any officials of the trade unions, should it be necessary for them to exercise the right of visiting these places. The Government had said that the employing of labour by means of registers was under their consideration. It seemed to him that under this Bill, the establishment of those offices and registers, by subsection (2), giving the Port authority power to make bye-laws with respect to admission to them, would be putting the control of them very largely in the hands of the employers, and that that would be very prejudicial to the success of the movement. After all, no fewer than 25,000 labourers in the Port of London would be influenced by this subsection, and if this subsection were passed as it stood, it would be very dangerous indeed. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 28, line 33, after the word 'labour' to insert the words 'and that no such offices, waiting-rooms, or employment registers shall be established and maintained inside the area of the dock premises.'"—(*Mr. Carr-Gomm.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he was not quite in love with the clause, because he thought that the waiting-rooms should be outside the door to enable the members of the trade unions and other associations to get in touch with the men. Nothing was more pitiable than to see these men standing outside the gates. It would be a very serious matter if these officials were shut out absolutely from contact with the men seeking employment.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the object of the clause was most valuable, since one of the greatest evils in connection with the docks was casual labour. He would remind the Committee that since this Amendment was put down, it had been decided to admit another labour member on the Port authority, and it should be left to the dock authority to regulate this matter of the register offices and waiting-rooms. He quite agreed with the statement that one of the worst features of the employment of casual labour was the men kept standing outside, and he thought it would be best to give power to the Port authority to deal with that.

MR. CARR-GOMM said that after that explanation he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 38 agreed to.

Clause 39:

MR. CHURCHILL said the Amendment which stood in his name was really only machinery in consequence of departmental agreement.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 32, line 14, at the end, to insert the words '(2) Sections fourteen and fifteen of the Harbours, Docks, and Piers Clauses Act, 1847 (which relate to the construction and maintenance of works for the accommodation of the officers of Customs), shall apply to the Port authority in respect of any new docks constructed by them in pursuance of the powers conferred by this Act as if they were incorporated in this Act, and shall also, as from the appointed day, apply to the Port authority in respect of all docks transferred to the Port authority by this Act which were constructed in pursuance of any special Act with which those sections are not incorporated: (*a*) As if those sections had been so incorporated; and (*b*) as if any watch-houses, boat-houses, huts, or weighing materials provided before the appointed day at those docks by any predecessors of the Port authority for the accommodation of those officers had been provided in pursuance of the obligation imposed by those sections. Provided that nothing in this provision shall prejudice or affect any right, or authority, or liability of the Commissioners of Customs, or the Commissioners of Works, under any agreement relating to any such watch-house, boat-house, hut, or weighing materials made before the passing of this Act between the Commissioners of Customs, or the Commissioners of Works, and any predecessors of the Port authority.' "—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 40 and 41 agreed to.

Clause 42:

MR. CHURCHILL said the following Amendments were made in consequence of representations made to the Board of Trade by the Office of Works and Admiralty. It secured them against damage caused by dredging. It was felt that they should be in the same position as the London County Council.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 33, line 1, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'any property of any Government Department or.' "

"In page 33, line 4, after the word 'of' to insert the words 'the department or'."—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester) moved to insert the words "Essex, Kent" after the word "or," in order to provide as in the case of Middlesex and Surrey that in regard to any works of dredging or deepening carried out within fifty yards of a bridge belonging to the Essex or Kent County Council the work should be done under the supervision of and to the reasonable satisfaction of the county council engineer.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 33, line 8, after the word 'or' to insert the words 'Essex, Kent.' "—(*Mr. E. H. Lamb.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: I am very glad indeed to meet the wishes of my hon. friend, and I in some respects recognise the urgency of his claim on behalf of Kent.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 43 to 46 agreed to.

Clause 47:

MR. CHURCHILL moved after the word "tonnage" to insert the word "port," which he said was consequential.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 35, line 35, after the word 'tonnage,' to insert the word 'port.' "—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Question, "That the word 'port' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 48 and 49 agreed to.

Clause 50:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 36, line 27, to leave out the word 'and,' and to insert the words 'but there shall be no adjustment of or concerning capital expenditure incurred prior to the appointed day below the city stone at Staines Bridge, nor with respect to the offices of the Conservancy, on the Victoria Embankment, in the County of London, or the superannuation or compensation of officers or servants transferred to the Port authority, and the Conservancy and their property shall be free and discharged from all liability in respect thereof.' "—(*Mr. Barnard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields): The clause which the hon. Member proposes to amend is the ordinary adjustment one. With regard to the first question as to the city stone at Staines Bridge, that appears to be superfluous, as all expenses incurred in that part of the river are charged on the lower navigation fund, and all the debts are transferred to the Port authority, so there is no adjustment. Then in regard to the other part, these servants may be transferred, and some adjustment may be necessary.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL asked what was the meaning of the final two lines in this section to the effect that the provisions as to borrowing and the application of capital sums should not apply to the Watermen's Company.

MR. CHURCHILL: This Bill, I am afraid, makes great inroads into the powers of the Watermen's Company. It takes away a great deal of their power, and gives it to the Port authority. It certainly must be regarded as a Bill which reduces very substantially the powers of the Watermen's Company, and for that reason it is not desirable that borrowing powers given to the Port authority under the Bill should be extended to the Watermen's Company.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 51 to 60 agreed to.

MR. BONAR LAW: Before we take the new clauses, might I venture to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to allow us to go home after a very fair day's work. All the time I have been in the House I have never seen—and I am perfectly sure the right hon. Gentleman and the Chancellor of the Exchequer will agree with me—a Bill which has gone through, not only with so little attempt at obstruction, but with every effort to help its progress on the part of the Opposition. It is not too much to say we have refrained from making speeches on questions in which we are interested. We have now been sitting up on three nights, and the Prime Minister himself said we should not be kept late to-night. I think, therefore, we may reasonably appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to allow us to go home now. I beg formally to move to report progress.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I understand that the right hon. Gentleman does not mean to press his Motion at this stage and only moves in order to elicit the intentions of the Government with regard to the further progress of the Bill. I trust he will allow us to proceed up to a certain point. I can quite see the reasonableness of his appeal that we should not sit very late, and the Government certainly do not complain of the attitude of the Opposition. I am not sure that most of the time has not been occupied by hon. Gentlemen who mostly support the Government. I am sure the criticisms which have emanated from the Opposition have been quite fair and relevant, and that they have not been made with any idea of obstruction; but still I think it is important that we should make further progress with the Bill. This will not be the last opportunity for criticising the Bill in detail, because there will be a Report stage and there will then be opportunity for further reference to any matter which may not have been fully ventilated. I think my right hon. friend has met the Opposition in one important particular. He has shown every disposition to afford opportunity both to criticise the Bill and to discuss important provisions at a reasonable period of the day. We have had a very lengthy debate to-day on what, after all, is one of the most important provisions of the Bill, and I do not think there is anything very important left. I trust the hon. Member opposite will allow us to proceed with the discussion, and then we will see later how to proceed. There is no disposition on the part of the Government to keep the House late, but I hope at present they will allow us to go on up to a certain point.

SIR F. BANBURY asked the right hon. Gentleman to say to what stage. He pointed out that on the new clause there was an Amendment standing in the name of an hon. friend, who, under the impression that the Motion for adjournment would last longer, had left the House and not returned. It was an important Amendment which ought to be discussed, but it was not unreasonable of his hon. friend to go away under the circumstances. They had sat till after twelve o'clock, and if the right hon. Gentleman would allow them to go home they would not take advantage in any way to delay the Bill.

MR. BONAR LAW: I have no desire, and my hon. friends have no desire, to prevent the Government getting their Bill through if we thought it could be done in a proper manner. My suggestion is that the right hon. Gentleman should allow us to finish now at the end of the existing clauses. We would not object to the subsequent clauses being taken at the same time as he proposes to take the Report stage.

LORD R. CECIL said it was a fact that the hon. Member for Bury was absent and that he had Amendments down to the new clause in the interest of the London County Council, of which body he was a member. It was only right he should be able to put their views before the House, and he thought it would be desirable if the Government could see their way to allow them to rise now and to proceed with the discussion of this new clause on another occasion. It was a question of considerable importance. He did not think it a very good plan to begin a controversial matter after twelve o'clock at night and it would not be a good example to the Opposition if, when they were reasonable as on this occasion, they were not treated with more conisderation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am very loth not to respond to an appeal from an Opposition which has been so very fairly and reasonably conducted, but I would again earnestly impress upon the Opposition the desirability of proceeding with this clause.

MR. BONAR LAW: May I make another suggestion? There seems to be very few Amendments down on the Schedules. Would it be agreeable to the Government to take the Schedules now and leave the new clause till afterwards?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Do I understand the hon. Member that the Bill should be taken without the new clause, seeing it is regarded, I will not say as controversial, but as one which should receive discussion under better opportunities? That is a reasonable proposal that we should go on to the schedule. As far as we are concerned we are prepared to withdraw the new clause and move it on Report, so that it will come first for discussion. It will be the first matter for discussion on Report stage.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BONAR LAW: Do I understand that the right hon. Gentleman will move the new clause in the Committee Stage?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No. What will be done will be this, that this new clause will be withdrawn at the present moment. Then it will be put down on the Report stage and the same procedure will be gone through as in Committee.

MR. BONAR LAW asked whether they did not miss the opportunity for discussion?

SIR F. BANBURY said he knew that was quite correct because he was caught that way himself the other day. If they took the new clauses on the Report stage the new clauses were always taken first; they were then read a second time. He was under the delusion that after that they went through the Committee stage, but he was called to order by Mr. Speaker for having that delusion, and it was pointed out to him that the House could not be in Committee with the Speaker in the Chair. Therefore, they got the disadvantage of Report stage of only being able to speak once. They lost all their chance of speaking more than once. The right hon. Gentleman knew that was a very valuable asset and was going to say nothing at all. If that were conceded it was nothing at all because they had discussion on the Report stage under any circumstances, and the only result of the right hon. Gentleman's action was to abandon discussion now to get what they always had under any circumstances on Report stage.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am still willing to meet the hon. Baronet, and after all, there is a good deal of substance in what he says now—as is generally the case. I think the Government might meet the Opposition by moving to recommit these new clauses after Second Reading and then putting the House into Committee.

MR. BONAR LAW assented to this.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There will be a Committee stage on those clauses after the Report stage.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Then I understand the right hon. Gentleman does not move his new clauses.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

*MR. MORTON intimated that he wished to move a clause to the effect that notwithstanding previous Acts any rates, dues, tolls, fees or other charges leviable under the present Act should be chargeable to and payable by the Crown upon the same conditions as they are chargeable and payable by other bodies or persons. The hon. Member said he knew he could move the clause on Report stage, but he wanted to know why his Motion should be treated differently from that of the Opposition. He did not call that at all fair, as not giving him an opportunity of being able to deal with it in the same spirit as the Opposition. But, of course, if the Government chose to treat him unfairly in that way, and to deal differently with one hon. Member and another, he could not help it.

MR. BONAR LAW suggested that the hon. Member should ask the Government to treat his clause in the same way as their own, provided the clause got a Second Reading.

MR. CHURCHILL: I shall be very glad indeed to do that and treat the hon. Member in exactly the same manner as we treat the new clauses which I have to move. Whether we can adopt his new clause or not is another matter.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other Member who has given notice of a new clause desire to move?

*MR. MORTON said he had another new clause and he suggested that it be treated in the same way.

Schedule I:

*MR. MORTON moved an Amendment so as to take away from the authority the power to appoint persons from outside to the working committees. The Schedule provided that the Port authority might appoint such working committees either of a general or special nature, and consisting of such number of persons and either wholly or partly of members of the Port authority as they thought fit. By that proviso the Port authority might pack all the committees with certain parties from outside on the understanding that they would vote as they were told. The only protection was in the words—

"provided that a majority of the members of every committee shall be members of the Port authority."

But that would not prevent a mere clique in the committee getting a majority if they could put enough strangers on. He would like to know why strangers of this sort, representing nobody at all but themselves, should be put upon the committees at all. He did not desire, if the bargain was made, to delay the Committee, and therefore with a view of trying to find what this meant he would move the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 49, line 18, to leave out the words 'persons, and either wholly or partly of.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not think the Committee will refuse to allow the Port authority power of co-optation.

MR. MORTON said it was never allowed anyone else.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think if the hon. Member, with his long experience, casts his mind wider and farther back he will be able to recall cases where power is given.

*Mr. MORTON said he did not quite understand. It was all very well to say there were precedents. He did not know if there were, but if so, they were very bad. What he would like to say was that they in the City of London would have a good deal to do with this Port of London business. They had always objected to that sort of representation in every case. No representative body of any consequence nowadays was allowed this sort of members. The county councils and the municipal bodies were allowed to appoint aldermen, but surely they did not want to repeat that. Everybody knew that having those nominated members called aldermen had been a sham and a fraud throughout the whole time of its existence and had very often enabled certain parties to pack the bodies just as they liked by getting these extra men in. He hoped that the Government would agree to the Amendment and consent to make this little alteration so that they might have the assurance that this Port of London authority would be as representative as the rest of the Bill had made it. This proposal at the end altered the constitution altogether by putting on strangers, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would concede this little improvement. He was sure it was an improvement.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Royal Commission recommended that the authority should have the power of appointing certain members from outside. There may be some committees of a highly expert and technical character, and it is desirable that there should be a member attached to such a committee who would not be of such a representative character as a member of the Port authority, but who would be of great value in guiding the committee on technical matters.

Sir WILLIAM BULL instanced Trinity House and the Thames Conservancy as having similar powers.

*Mr. MORTON said the Thames Conservancy had no such powers. They were all elected by somebody outside. He thought that the fact that the Royal Commission recommended this was of no consequence at all. It was of much more importance that they as a Liberal Party had always recognised that the members of all these institutions should be representative, representing the people. That was the whole policy and foundation of the Liberal Party, but by this proviso to the Schedule, the committee might be so packed that they would never get at the opinion of the properly representative members at all. The Royal Commission did not affect him. Royal Commissions were generally wrong, and did not do much good, and he should stick to this Amendment as far as he could.

Amendment negatived.

*Mr. MORTON moved an Amendment to make all the meetings of the Port authority open to the public unless otherwise determined by the majority of the members present and voting on that question. He said that such a proposal as this, where adopted, had been found useful. Sometimes these so-called public bodies excluded the public and the Press. What he desired was that there should be always at these meetings at least some representatives of the Press, so that the public might know what went on. With regard to the Thames Conservancy, when he joined it some years ago the doors were shut and the Press excluded, but very shortly after the Conservators were induced to allow the Press to be present, and it had very much improved the body. He copied the words of his Amendment from the Standing Orders of the Court of Common Council, where it had been in force for hundreds of years. It had always been found to work well. It made the normal conditions of the meetings open to the public, but gave the body absolute power at once to close them if they had any business which it was thought necessary to transact with closed doors. The old custom in the House of Commons was that any person might get the House cleared of strangers by calling out "I spy strangers," but of late years the custom had been exactly what he recommended, namely, that somebody must move to exclude the public, and the majority of those present settled the question by vote. All over the country it had been found not only absolutely right and proper, but an improvement on the procedure that the Press and public should be allowed to be present. There was the recent experience of the London County Council, who knew something about what ought to be done in these matters. When they commenced the education business they closed the doors of the education committee. They were strongly recommended, however, considering the nature of the business the committee had to do, and how separate it was from the other business of the Council, to open their doors. They in this House even opened the doors of the Committees, so that there was nothing extraordinary in the proposal. A great many of the large municipalities in the country opened the doors at their committee meetings to the public. He would not detain the House though he could give a long list of institutions which allowed the Press and the public to be present. The best men on the London County Council and outside were all in favour of the meetings of the schools committee being open to the public. They had been open for a good while now, and no harm had been done. Surely, then, they might ask that a public body like the Port authority whose principal business would be to look after the docks and holders of stock, should sit with open doors. It would have to deal with one of the greatest businesses in any part of the world, and if the meetings of any public body ought to be open to the public and the Press, it should be those of the Port of London authority, who were concerned with so many interests, and about whose proceedings the public had a right to know.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 50, line 11, at end, to insert the words 'All the meetings of the Port authority shall be open to the public unless otherwise determined by the majority of the members present and voting on that question.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot accept the Amendment. An identical Amendment was moved before the Joint Committee on behalf of the Corporation of London, and was objected to by the Committee. It is believed that an Amendment of this kind is entirely without precedent in any similar case. It certainly does not exist in the case of the Mersey, the Tyne, or the Clyde. There is a danger which we have noticed that when the Press are present there is a tendency on the part of some members to make long speeches, and it is thought that the proceedings of the Port authority are likely to be more expeditiously conducted if the meetings are held in private.

*MR. MORTON said in answer to the right hon. Gentleman that when, between the years 1892 and 1895, they were considering the Local Government Bill of that time, the House of Commons, which was apparently more Liberal and democratic than the present, inserted a similar clause at his request with regard to the meetings of the parish councils. He was sorry that the present House of Commons did not appear to be either so democratic or so wedded to the old Liberal institutions and procedure as were their predecessors. He would have thought that a Liberal Government would have gladly accepted a proposal of this sort.

Amendment negatived.

MR. HOLT moved an Amendment to omit paragraph (3) of the proviso of Part II. of the Schedule, all words after the second "authority." He said it seemed that this method of voting on a matter in which members were personally interested arising in the ordinary course of the Port authority's business, might prove in practice to work considerable injustice, and be impossible to carry out. He did not know exactly what the meaning of the clause was, but he should like to put it this way: after all, the members of this Port authority would be sent there by electors with their eyes open. They would not be sent there with the idea that they had no financial interest, but expressly because they had a large financial interest themselves in the Port. Suppose there was a warehouse committee, and a discussion arose as to the way in which grain had been stored in the warehouses, was it to be contended that the representative of the grain trade was to be debarred from voting simply because it happened that he had a certain amount of his own produce stored there? The real question surely was whether the interest of the individual member was merely incidental, whether he was voting in the interest of his trade, as a whole, and in the interests of the people who sent him there. His vote ought not to be disallowed merely because he himself had an interest in the particular matter which was being voted on. On the other hand, if it were a matter which affected merely himself, of course, he ought not to vote. They might be quite certain that a body constituted as this body would be by leading merchants of London, men of honour and position, could settle such matters for themselves. It would be very soon found out whether a man had got on the authority to vote to put sixpence in his pocket, or to vote in the interests of the trade he was sent there to represent. He would suggest to the Government that they should make this clause fairly free and easy, and not bind it down by hard and fast regulations, but leave it to the discretion of the body themselves.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 50, line 42, to leave out from the word 'authority' to end of paragraph."—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I shall be quite willing to accept this Amendment.

*Mr. MORTON said he would like some explanation with regard to this. It was a most dangerous thing to allow any member of an authority to vote where he might be directly or indirectly concerned. In the City of London they insisted on this matter so strongly that in the protection of their rules of procedure they went right up to the House of Lords to enforce them. They were not allowed to be interested directly or indirectly in any way in a contract. It was very little to say they should not vote on matters with which they were themselves concerned, and he trusted the Government would not give way on the point.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DICKINSON moved an Amendment to provide that the members of the Port Authority should go out of office on 1st April, 1913, instead of 1st June, 1912. His reason was this: There were to be four members on the Port Authority to represent the London County Council, and they would—with the exception, of course, of the members who represented the City—be the only members who represented the people of London. Under the provisions contained in the Bill there would be this curious condition of affairs: The London County Council was elected for three years, and the representatives on the new Port Authority were also to hold office for three years. Inasmuch, however, as the statutory dates for the election of the London County Council were in 1910 and 1913 the members appointed to represent the Council on the new authority would be appointed at the very end of the tenure of office of the Council. The result would be that practically during two and a half years of the tenure of office of the Council that body would be represented on the Port Authority by members who had been nominated by the previous Council. Such a state of things, he thought, would be very undesirable, and he was seeking by his proposal to prevent it. A further suggestion he had to make was that the London County Council's new representatives should be elected in 1910, but he would first move the insertion of April, 1913, in place of June, 1912.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 51, line 29, to leave out the word 'twelve,' and insert the word 'ten.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'twelve' stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am quite willing to accept that Amendment.

*SIR A. SPICER said he should like to point out to the Committee that there was a good deal of discussion in the Joint Committee with regard to giving an extra year, and the members of that Committee thought it would be a great mistake to make the extension, as they considered the period named in the Bill quite long enough in the case of a nominated body. The date in the Bill was originally 1913, and the Joint Committee deliberately reduced it by one year, because they thought the time sufficiently long for the term of office of the first nominated body.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. DICKINSON moved to insert after the word the Committee had just agreed to, "and in the case of members appointed by the London County Council 1910." That meant, he said, that the first election of members of the County Council would take place in 1910, immediately after the formation of the new County Council.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 51, line 29, after the word last inserted, to insert the words 'and in the case of members appointed by the London County Council 1910.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

MR. HOLT, on Part IV. of the Schedule (Provisions as to Election of Elected Members), moved to leave out subsection (1) (*a*). Any one who read the Bill, he observed, would find that the latter part of subsection (1) was more or less a contradiction of subsection (1) (*a*). Subsection (1) provided that—

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, elections of elected members shall be held at such times and in such manner, and in accordance with such regulations, as the Board of Trade may by order direct; and those regulations may contain all things necessary, preliminary, or incidental, to the election. Provided that, in prescribing the manner in which elections are to be conducted and votes are to be recorded, the Board of Trade shall have regard to the desirability of elections being so conducted and votes being so recorded, whether by allowing the voter to record a vote for a number of candidates in order of preference, or otherwise, as to secure that so far as possible the several interests concerned shall be adequately represented on the Port authority."

He supposed "adequately represented" meant represented in proportion to financial liability, and that surely ought to be the basis of representation of the different interests on the Port authority. But subsection (1) (*a*) told them the regulations might provide that, subject to duly qualified candidates presenting themselves, certain interests—those who paid dues on ships and those who paid dues on goods—should be equally represented. On referring to the proceedings of the Joint Committee, he found that this was put in because it had been observed that the custom had grown up in Liverpool of dividing the representation equally between the payers of dues on ships and the payers of dues on goods. He would point out, however, by way of explanation, that the reason the custom grew up in Liverpool was because these parties were paying an equal amount of money. There was no reason why they should be equal other than that they were contributing an equal amount. He considered that to lay down that the two parties ought to be equally represented without binding them to bear an equal share of the burden was not a fair thing to do. If they wanted to induce people to bear their fair share of the burden of the expense of the port in a cheerful spirit it was just as well to let them understand that they would not get representation on the Port authority unless they were willing to bear that share. Therefore he thought subsection (1) should be allowed to stand by itself without qualification.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 52, to leave out lines 33 to 37, inclusive.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. CHURCHILL: I am sorry I cannot accept the Amendment. The clause is an agreed clause. It was inserted after a good deal of discussion, and is regarded as a most valuable clause. The object is to enable the

Board of Trade to exercise a moderating influence and as far as possible to preserve a just balance of representation on the Port authority. I hope my hon. friend, whose views are very valuable and important, will not consider that every deviation from the excellent precedent provided in Liverpool is necessarily to be expunged from the Bill.

MR. HOLT was willing to respond at once to his right hon. friend's appeal. The right hon. Gentleman had met them all very fairly, but at the same time the provision of this clause ought to be carefully borne in mind, and people who paid dues on goods should remember that if they were to have half the representation they should not make too much fuss if they asked to pay half the bill.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 54, line 32, after the word 'craft' to insert the words 'or other person.'"—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*MR. SEAVERNS moved to omit from Part IV. of the Schedule subsection (17), which reads: "For the purposes of the first election under this Act 'dues' shall include dues of such classes and in respect of such services only as may be prescribed." He desired to call the attention of the Committee to the last subsection in Part IV. of the Schedule, because, though it was a comparatively innocent looking little paragraph, it raised a question of considerable importance. The effect of the paragraph, as the Committee would see, was to leave in the hands of the Board of Trade the privilege of adjusting the franchise so as to give the Board complete control of the first election to the Port authority. He thought that was a very dangerous and a very unwise power to place in the hands of any Government Department. The power of the Government Departments was continually on the increase. He believed it was generally exercised wisely, but the increase of power ought to be viewed rather jealously by the House of Commons. This Amendment was looked upon as one of very great importance, because, as he understood, before the Joint Committee a representative of the Board of Trade said he was very doubtful whether the payers of landing, storing, and delivering charges on goods in docks would receive voting powers in respect of those charges. Considerable controversy arose on this point, and eventually the Committee cut down the privilege proposed to be asked for by the Board of Trade by limiting it to the first election. He submitted that the privilege should not be enjoyed by the Board of Trade even in the case of the first election, and he hoped the Government would see their way to withdraw this objectionable paragraph.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 55, line 28, to leave out subsection (17)."—(*Mr. Seaverns.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. CHURCHILL: This subsection was divided upon by the Joint Committee after prolonged discussion to decide what payments should be treated as dues and qualify for votes at the first election. The Board of Trade must be trusted—they have already been given so much power, that if they are untrustworthy the Bill must be absolutely a failure—to prescribe the payers of dues in order that injustice may not be done to particular classes.

Amendment negatived.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 369.]

Whereupon MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at four minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 13th November, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LAND JUDGE'S COURT (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th November; *Mr. Clancy*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 323.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report, No. 583 (Southern Nigeria, Annual Report for 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (PROCLAMATIONS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th November; *Mr. Eugene Wason*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 324.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Distress Committees—Grouped Districts.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any steps are being taken, or will be taken, to group localities with a population of less than 10,000, in order that a distress committee may be created for the district.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, does not admit of the grouping of districts with a view to establishing in the grouped area a distress committee who would be enabled to provide or to contribute towards the provision of work for the unemployed. I am afraid, therefore, that it would not be practicable to give effect to the object which my hon. friend appears to have in view.

Trawling off the Bell Rock.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will take the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to whether the Bell Rock is or is not part of British territory; and, if he is advised that the Bell Rock is part of the territory of Great Britain, whether he will consider the advisability of prohibiting trawling under bye-law within three miles of that place.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I can only refer my hon. friend to my reply on the 15th June as stating the position of the Government.

Meat Inspection in Scotland.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether in view of the increase to be presently effected in the staffing and personnel of the Local Government Board for Scotland he will undertake that a veterinary surgeon with practical experience in meat inspection will be appointed to that Board in order to unify the standard of meat inspection throughout Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I can only inform my hon. friend that if and when an increase of staff of the Local Government Board is necessary all the representations that have been made will have due consideration.

Reports of School Inspectors.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): To ask the President of the Board of Education why the General Report of the Board no longer contains the reports of the school inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The preparation of these reports involved considerable time and labour, which it was thought could be more profitably devoted to active work in the inspectors' districts. In place of them the Board now issue from time to time reports on particular subjects of special interest.

Small Holdings.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will state the total number of applications that have been made for small holdings under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act; the number of applicants approved as suitable; and the number of those whose applications have been satisfied.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The following table gives the information desired—

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

County.	Total number of applications.	Total acreage applied for.	Approximate number of approved applicants.	Estimated acreage required for approved applicants.	Quantity of land already arranged to be acquired in acres.	Number of applicants provided for by the council.	Number of applicants provided for by private landlords.	Remarks.
England:								
Beds. - -	435	6,500	No definite information available		376	20, and 1 co-operative society	—	
Berks. - -	306	9,347	131	5,003	1,395	1	—	
Bucks. - -	435	9,254	248	5,000	300	8	—	Inquiries into applications not yet completed.
Cambridge -	1,107	11,600	800	7,000	1,408	145	9	
Chester - -	228	5,232	112	2,246	941	—	—	
Cornwall - -	179	2,552	153	2,314	223	11	—	
Cumberland -	62	1,289	25	351	—	—	5	
Derby - -	153	2,284	No definite information available			—	—	
Devon -	419	7,200	234	1,245	159	—	22	
Dorset - -	291	5,206	171	2,986	27	1	20	750 acres proposed to be hired compulsorily.
Durham - -	350	6,452	314	5,529	170	—	—	
Essex - -	468	7,612	181	2,381	322	12	13	

Gloucester -	551	9,986	531	No definite information available	503	43	32	
Hereford - -	320	6,538	179	3,352	—	—	10	
Herts. - -	221	4,911	113	2,048	329	28	2	
Hunts. - -	479	5,848	291	3,620	640	3	—	314 acres proposed to be acquired compulsorily. Inquiries into applications not yet completed.
Isle of Ely -	1,200	10,400	570	1,500 to 2,000	374	78	—	
Isle of Wight -	103	2,045	86	1,644	344	8	—	
Kent - -	714	9,648	432	6,000	496	31	12	
Lancs. - -	191	2,850	123	1,600	—	—	5	
Leicester - -	311	5,873	176	3,085	620	—	No definite information available	
Lincs. (Holland)	550	8,540	400	5,762	338	8	—	
,, (Kesteven)	257	4,288	158	2,374	384	—	—	
,, (Lindsey)	519	9,820	440	7,000	39	—	—	
London - -	30	306	—	—	—	—	—	
Middlesex -	180	1,667	38	644	—	—	—	Inquiries into applications not yet completed.

County.	Total number of applications.	Total acreage applied for.	Approximate number of approved applicants.	Estimated acreage required for approved applicants.	Quantity of land already arranged to be acquired in acres.	Number of applicants provided for by the council.	Number of applicants provided for by private landowners.	Remarks.
England—*cont.*								
Monmouth -	265	5,882	113	1,484	—	—	—	
Norfolk - -	1,644	23,000	778	9,062	1,807	76	1	
Northants -	714	6,975	540	6,100	408	2, and 2 co-operative societies	—	
Northumberland	420	11,465	251	7,009	78	—	12	
Notts. - -	225	3,708	65	1,173	—	—	—	
Oxford - -	589	12,240	416	7,084	515	28	36	
Rutland - -	52	119	23	224	25	1	4	Inquiries into applications not yet completed.
Salop - -	386	5,728	208	3,189	160	6	52	
Soke of Peterborough	46	739	No definite information available		114	7	—	232 acres proposed to be acquired compulsorily.
Somerset -	1,844	24,319	1,027	14,176	765	—	32	
Southampton -	513	7,579	222	2,354	15	3	4	
Stafford - -	214	3,452	112	2,000	—	—	5	

Suffolk, East -	260	4,206	81	1,188	274	—	7	Inquiries into applications not yet completed.
,, West -	254	3,620	83	881	—	—	7	Do. do.
Surrey - -	244	2,704	104	1,272	—	—	3	
Sussex, East -	204	3,020	98	1,560	—	—	12	
,, West -	126	1,980	72	982	—	—	11	
Warwick -	358	7,159	60	933	—	—	12	Inquiries into applications not yet completed.
Westmoreland -	34	570	16	304	44	5	2	
Wilts - -	779	15,437	395	7,289	482	2, and 1 co-operative society	6	
Worcester -	978	8,644	801	4,500	148	33	40	
Yorks., East Riding	569	13,017	93	1,392	—	—	3	The remaining applicants have not been definitely rejected.
Yorks., North Riding	293	5,541	143	2,440	—	—	—	
Yorks., West Riding	270	4,409	153	No definite information available	—	—	11	
Total -	21,340	332,761	11,760	159,780	14,223	560, and 4 co-operative societies.	390	

County.	Total number of applications.	Total acreage applied for.	Approximate number of approved applicants.	Estimated acreage required for approved applicants.	Quantity of land already arranged to be acquired in acres.	Number of applicants provided for by the council.	Number of applicants provided for by private landowners.	Remarks.
Wales:								
Anglesey -	232	3,745	134	2,725	415	13	—	
Brecknock -	182	3,200	No definite	information	available	—	—	
Cardigan -	103	1,600	No definite	information	available	—	—	150 acres proposed to be acquired compulsorily.
Carmarthen -	84	1,715	58	1,242	27	2	—	
Carnarvon -	62	864	21	244	—	—	—	
Denbigh - -	157	1,840	93	1,526	48	2	—	
Flint - -	98	1,803	56	1,200	—	—	—	
Glamorgan -	358	7,053	183	3,646	—	—	—	
Merioneth -	37	603	15	264	—	—	1	
Montgomery -	210	3,800	200	3,620	—	—	24	
Pembroke -	128	2,394	55	1,165	—	—	—	
Radnor - -	106	2,300	No definite avail	information able	269	14	10	
Total - -	1,757	30,917	815	15,632	759	31	35	
Grand total for England and Wales	23,097	363,678	12,575	175,412	14,982	591 and 4 co-operative societies.	425	

Wages Census.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can now state what progress has been made with the wage census, the result of which the Board of Trade expected to be able to publish at an earlier date; and when the Report, or any part of it, is likely to be laid before Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) A very much larger number of returns has been received than was originally anticipated; and this gratifying fact has naturally caused a little delay in the final tabulation of the results. Considerable progress has, however, been made in the tabulation of the returns received. The Report on the Textile Trades is approaching completion, and it will I hope be issued about the end of the year. Further reports will follow as rapidly as possible.

Goods Traffic from Nottingham to the North.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that inconvenience is being caused and financial loss inflicted on the commercial community in Nottingham through the action of the North Eastern Railway Company refusing to expedite the delivery of goods from tradesmen in that city to customers north of York; that goods are often delayed at the depot of the North Eastern Railway Company at York from four to six days, and that when they are approached with a view to more expeditious delivery they decline to accede to such request; and will he take such action as will result in the removal of this grievance.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am in correspondence on this matter with the Nottingham Chamber of Commerce, and I have asked that body to furnish me with specific instances of delay which can be put before the railway company, with whom I propose to communicate.

Suggested Displacement of Civilians by Military in Dublin Post Office.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is intended, in view of the contemplated change of bringing the Royal Engineers to the southern district of Ireland, to displace the present civilian employees in the engine-room at the general post office and Amiens Street parcel depot, Dublin, and to employ military instead; whether in the event of these civilians being displaced by the military, suitable situations would be found for them elsewhere; and whether the cost of transfer and location expenses for themselves and their families is to be awarded to all the classes whom it is proposed to transfer.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is no such intention.

Defective Cottage at Mill Street.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether complaints have been received by the Local Government Board relative to the condition of a cottage in the Mill Street rural district occupied by a labourer named Daniel O'Connor; whether he is aware that this cottage was condemned originally for defective construction by the engineer of the Board, and that the contractor for the erection of this cottage failed properly to perform his contract; and, seeing that the cottage is not at present in anything like habitable repair, will steps be taken to have the numerous existing defects remedied forthwith.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have received complaints as to the condition of the cottage referred to in the Question. In May 1905 one of the Board's inspectors, who was inspecting the cottages then being built, reported that this cottage required to be re-dashed and re-painted. The Board have urged the rural district council to carry out the necessary repairs.

QUESTIONS ON FRIDAY.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.) had the following Question on the Paper: "To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that inconvenience is being caused and financial loss inflicted on the commercial community in Nottingham through the action of the North Eastern Railway Company refusing to expedite the delivery of goods from tradesmen in that city to customers north of York; that goods are often delayed at the depot of the North Eastern Railway Company at York for four to six days, and that when they are approached with a view to more expeditious delivery they decline to accede to such request; and will he take such action as will result in the removal of this grievance."

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, as a point of order, how it comes to be on the Paper on Friday?

*MR. SPEAKER: Any Member is at liberty to put down Questions on Friday, and any Minister is at liberty not to be in his place to answer them.

MR. RICHARDSON: I beg to as Question No. 1.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE not being present, no Answer was returned.

LICENSING BILL.

As amended, considered.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.) moved the following new clause: "(1) Nothing in the Licensing Acts with respect to closing hours shall prevent the supply of intoxicating liquor in any licensed premises on Sunday during any hours during which those premises might have been open on Sunday for the sale of intoxicating liquor before the passing of this Act to any person taking a meal on the premises in a room set apart for the purpose. (2) It is hereby declared that notwithstanding anything in the Licensing Acts with respect to the closing of licensed premises refreshments (other than intoxicating liquor) may be supplied to any person during closing hours, and no person is liable to any penalty under the Licensing Acts for supplying any such refreshments, or for being on licensed premises during closing hours for the purpose of obtaining any such refreshments." The hon. and learned Gentleman said that the first sub-clause had become necessary by reason of Amendments which the Government promised to make when they were discussing Clause 18 of the Bill in Committee. That discussion took place on a Friday, and very interesting speeches were made, one certainly not the least important or interesting by the Leader of the Opposition, to which he and they all listened with a great deal of pleasure, although they did not agree with every part of it. He would state quite shortly what the provisions would be as regards Sunday closing, before he came to the Amendment. The proposals to be adopted, as they were now upon the Paper, would be that, instead of six hours Sunday opening in the country there would be three hours, and instead of seven hours in London there would be four hours. The six hours which were the opening hours in the country under the present law were the two hours from 12.30 to 2.30 in the afternoon, subject to the local alteration which might be made by local justices, and 6 to 10 in the evening; while in London they were 1 to 3 in the afternoon and 6 to 11 in the evening. For ordinary public-houses and for ordinary drinking facilities, as he had said, the hours would be reduced in the country from six to three hours, and in the Metropolitan district from seven to four hours. But it was pointed out that there would be a great inconvenience arising from this change to people in the habit of dining at restaurants on Sundays, and the first sub-section of his new clause was to provide for that. It was quite simple, and what it meant was that for the purpose of people who were desirous of taking meals upon licensed premises on Sunday the hours were to be exactly the same as the hours for opening under the present law, and, of course, during the consumption of the meal, and as part of the meal, it would be quite possible for the person partaking of the meal to get his intoxicating liquor in the hotel without infringing the law. The second sub-section was a declaratory clause. A good deal of discussion had arisen in the House, and in the Press also, upon the state of the law as it at present existed. He was responsible, so far as this Bill was concerned, to the best of his ability, for placing in the possession of the Members who had to listen to him the state of the law. He could not always be right, no lawyer ever was, and it was very difficult for any lawyer however eminent to say what was meant until they got to the House of Lords, and then lawyers who were over-ruled by that tribunal were apt to say that the House of Lords were mistaken. He had looked into this matter very carefully since the discussion in the House, and, fortunately, it was the Prime Minister who first, in his capacity as lawyer and not as First Lord of the Treasury, stated what his view of the law was. The Prime Minister said that whatever privileges hotels and refreshment rooms enjoyed now they would enjoy subsequent to this limitation. The law, as he understood it, was plain. And then he said that—

> "Places where liquor was sold by retail were to be closed for that purpose and no other. It was lawful to keep the premises open for the accommodation of wants such as a cup of tea or milk, and that they were closed merely for the purpose of supplying drink."

Then there was an interruption by the hon. Member for Cambridge University, and the Prime Minister said he thought his hon. friend would agree with him that that was generally understood to be the law, that no offence would be committed, and the law would remain as it was. He agreed with that view. Later on in the discussion, on being pressed, he said that that being their view of the law he was quite willing to put down a declaratory clause to that effect, in order that, if there should be any doubt, that doubt should no longer exist. Since that discussion, he had had the opportunity of looking into the matter further and the benefit of reading the criticisms which had been made by other people. As a result, he was strengthened in his opinion that the Prime Minister's view of the law was right. It was quite true that, if they merely looked at Section 3 of the Act of 1874, the words appeared to be clear and imperative. The words were that the premises "shall be closed" during certain hours. The provision which was in force before Section 3 of the Act of 1874 was contained in Section 24 of the Act of 1872. That section was repealed and was split up into other sections, and certain of its contents now appeared as Sections 3, 9, 10, and possibly some others in the Act of 1874. He thought it would be abundantly clear that in the Act of 1872 closing merely meant a prohibition against supplying intoxicating liquors—in other words, that the premises need not be closed for any lawful purpose such as serving a meal. When they came to the Act of 1874, Sections 9 and 10, it was quite clear that no penalty was laid upon anybody who did not keep his premises closed. The penalty was confined, in the one case, to the person selling drink, and, in the other, to the person obtaining drink for the purpose of consumption. It was admitted by all lawyers that there was no penalty under the Act itself if the premises were open, unless they were open for the purpose of supplying drink. But it had been pointed out by an old and eminent friend of his, Sir Harry Poland, in a letter to *The Times*, that it might, nevertheless, be that there was a disobedience to the provision of the Act of Parliament which required that the premises should be closed, and then, for such disobedience, the old common law doctrine came in, namely, that they could indict a person who was disobedient to the command of the statute. That was true as a general principle, but it was to be limited by this, that if it appeared by the statute that, for whatever offence was created, there was a penalty also created by the statute, they did not invoke the common law right of prosecuting by way of indictment. Sir Harry Poland himself, in the letter to which he had referred, said he was not quite prepared to say that an indictment would lie. Sir Harry was as modest as a lawyer of his eminence always was. But others were not so modest, and the leader writer of *The Times* rushed in where Sir Harry Poland feared to tread. This was what the leader writer of *The Times* said in the matter—

> "The Solicitor-General has committed himself to the proposition that a public-house may be open during closing hours for the sale of food so long as drink is not sold. Some one ironically told him to go and learn law from the policeman outside."

Personally, he did not mind from whom he learned law if only he could learn it—

> "And one does not need to be either a Solicitor-General or a policeman to see that the law plainly forbids the house to be open during certain hours without any mention of the

things sold. The offence is complete if the house is open."

One did not need to be either a Solicitor-General or a policeman to know that. All he needed to be was an anonymous leader writer on *The Times* newspaper.

> "As for the public who may want food, they must suffer under the restrictions imposed upon those who want drink. The contention to the contrary is typical of the careless way in which the whole subject has been treated."

Let him give the House two or three instances to show that it was impossible that there could be an offence constituted as suggested—the offence of opening the premises, or rather, not keeping the premises closed, although there was no intention to supply drink at all. In the first place, if there were an absolute imperative command in Section 3 of the Act of 1874, it was quite clear that the House could not be opened for the purpose of allowing a lodger or a *bona fide* traveller to enter, because, when they came to Sections 9 and 10, what they found was that the licensed victualler was allowed to supply drink to the lodger or to the *bona fide* traveller. If it was necessary for him to close his premises, then these sections ought to have provided that he ought, also, to be allowed to open the premises for the purpose he had indicated. There was another matter which, he thought, made it even much clearer. It was the provision with regard to six days licences. The provision with regard to these licences was Section 10 of the Act of 1874, which provided that no person holding a six days licence should sell any intoxicating liquor on Sunday to any person whatever not lodging in his house. The House would see that a person holding a six days licence could not supply drink even to a *bona fide* traveller on Sunday. He also wanted to call attention to the position of the innkeeper, who might, or might not, be an ale-house keeper. Under the old common law, if an innkeeper was also an ale-house keeper, his house was subject to the provisions with regard to closing in the Act of 1874. By the common law, every person who kept a common inn was under an obligation to receive, and to offer proper entertainment to every one who offered himself as his guest if there was sufficient room for him in the inn. It had also been held that, if an innkeeper refused to accommodate a traveller or wayfarer, he was liable to prosecution by way of indictment, and it had been further held by the Courts that it was not a defence for the innkeeper to say that his guest was travelling on a Sunday and at an hour of night when the innkeeper and his family had gone to bed. So that an innkeeper who was an alehouse-keeper was in the position that he must open his house for the traveller, who was not necessarily the same person as the *bona fide* traveller—that was the common law of the matter—otherwise he was guilty of an offence. The argument on the other side was that, if he opened his house on Sunday, he was liable to prosecution by way of indictment. What an extraordinary state of things that would be! The position was this. The common law said they could indict an innkeeper who refused to supply reasonable refreshments to the traveller or wayfarer, and, at the same time, it was said they could also indict him if he opened his house. That was a state of things which was absolutely impossible. He desired to make one further observation with reference to the provision as regarded refreshment houses under the Act of 1864. It was quite clear, upon reference to the sections dealing with these houses, in so far as they now applied, that these houses could not be opened to supply any refreshments at all. That was a specific enactment. No doubt it might be argued, if that were so with regard to refreshment houses, why not with regard to licensed houses; but that was not a legal argument. He thought that Sir Harry Poland's letter must have been written in his well-earned leisure, when he had no access to his law-books. This was a matter that had been decided for thirty-one years. It came up for decision in 1877 before Mr. Justice Mellor and Mr. Justice Field, in the Divisional Court, and on this matter, in this form, there had not been any question of appeal. The question arose with regard to a grocer's licence, but that made no difference at all, because the provisions with regard to closing were precisely the same in the case of an off-licence as they were in the case of an ordinary licence. Mr. Justice Mellor, in his judgment said—

> "This conviction cannot be upheld. I do not know what may have been the original intention

of the legislature, but I think that Section 3 has not the meaning which at first sight it would appear to have, and that the penalty is not imposed upon any person who, after the hour mentioned in the section, keeps open his premises for some purpose unconnected with the sale of intoxicating liquors. . . . Taking these facts together, I think the safer construction of Section 3 is to hold that it applies to persons who, after the prescribed hour, keep open their premises for the purpose of selling liquor, but that the magistrates are not justified in convicting when it appears that nothing of the kind was intended. In *Brigden* v. *Heighes* the argument of the counsel for the appellant and the judgment of the Court rely, no doubt, upon the fact that there was a *bona fide* closing of the grocer's shop, and not merely upon the fact that there was no evidence that liquor was exposed for sale, and both I and my brother Field probably used expressions from which it might be argued that we thought that the Act requires that the house and premises where the liquor is sold must be closed. But we had not to consider a case like the present, and I must hold that, in the absence of proof that there was a sale or exposure for sale of liquor, the conviction was wrong."

Mr. Justice Field, having stated that he was of the same opinion went on to say that—

> "The statement in the case, 'the justices thought that Sections 3 and 9 were unexceptional, and that it was imperative that the appellant should close his licensed premises at ten o'clock,' shows that they thought they were bound to convict. The construction of Section 3 which Mr. Biron has suggested, according to which there is a simple prohibition to keep open, during certain hours, premises of a particular description, at first caused me some difficulty, but the arguments which we have heard have quite removed it."

That was a definite and distinct decision on the point. That was all he had to say in justification of the view expressed by the Prime Minister and himself upon the law of the matter. They had now declared the law so that hereafter there might be no doubt. With regard to policy, it had been thought by some of his hon. friends that it would have been better to leave the law in the state of doubt in which it was than to have dissipated the doubt. Though he did not think there was any doubt, he did not think that they were proceeding upon at all unsound lines in declaring the law to be as it was. It had been said that there would be a difficulty in policing That was possible. On the other hand, licensed victuallers would be very careful before they opened their premises, because if the premises were once opened, a prosecutor need only go one step further and bring some *prima facie* evidence that they were opened for the purpose of selling or the consumption of intoxicating liquour. Immediately they gave *prima facie* evidence which would lead to that conclusion, the onus was on the other side to show that the premises were not open for such purpose and that anybody that might be on the premises was not present for an illegal purpose. Therefore, licensed victuallers, especially at the present day when the magistrates and police were vigilant to secure the proper observance of the law, would be extremely careful not to open their premises for the purposes of evading the law, because if it was proved after these declarations they did so they would be face to face with the possibility—almost the certainty—that their licences would be taken from them without any compensation. Members on both sides of the House were anxious to make the public-house something more than a mere place for drinking. The more they increased the facilities for the supply of meals there the better the public-house might be. He thought it would be intolerable that the law should be such that, supposing a respectable individual—supposing he himself—happened to be in a village where there were licensed premises, and at eleven o'clock on Sunday morning, not necessarily having travelled three miles—

AN HON. MEMBER: Six miles.

SIR S. EVANS: Or six miles. The question of being a traveller did not enter into this matter. If in such circumstances he told a respectable ale-house keeper that he wanted some bacon and eggs and a cup of coffee—that he had not had his breakfast—it would be intolerable that the man being willing to serve him should not be allowed to do so.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): The hon. and learned Gentleman forgets that he ought to be at church at eleven o'clock.

SIR S. EVANS said he would make the hour half-past ten o'clock, and would suppose that he told the alehouse-keeper that he was extremely anxious to have a nice breakfast in order that he might go to church, for, as a child could not benefit by teaching if sent starving to school, it was possible that he could not enjoy the service and sermon without having breakfasted. It would be intolerable that the alehouse-keeper should not be allowed to provide him with a meal if the man were willing to do so, for, of course, unless the alehouse-keeper were an innkeeper he would not be bound to admit him to the premises at that hour. It was a very interesting point and a very important one, and for that reason he wished to make quite clear to the House what the law was, and he also wanted to say to those friends of his who feared that this would lead to the improper use of a public-house, that the Government on the other hand believed it would have the exactly contrary effect. He begged to move.

New clause—

(1) Nothing in the Licensing Acts with respect to closing hours shall prevent the supply of intoxicating liquor in any licensed premises on Sunday during any hours during which those premises might have been open on Sunday for the sale of intoxicating liquor before the passing of this Act to any person taking a meal on the premises in a room set apart for the purpose. (2) It is hereby declared that notwithstanding anything in the Licensing Acts with respect to the closing of licensed premises refreshments (other than intoxicating liquor) may be supplied to any person during closing hours, and no person is liable to any penalty under the Licensing Acts for supplying any such refreshments, or for being on licensed premises during closing hours for the purpose of obtaining any such refreshments.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

*MR. G. D. FABER (York) said the House was delighted though somewhat surprised to learn from the hon. and learned Gentleman that his proper condition precedent to divine worship was bacon, eggs, and coffee. He had always understood that fasting was the more appropriate accompaniment of prayer. Members of the Opposition had, during the Committee stage of this Bill, always appreciated the ability and urbanity of the hon. and learned Gentleman. They never quite knew which predominated. It was sometimes the one and sometimes the other. But it would need all those great qualities to justify the position in which the Solicitor-General now found himself at this late stage of the Bill. The Bill, in many respects, resembled the chameleon, which changed its hue from day to day, either according to the particular advice of the Gentleman who happened to be in charge of it, or according to that particular party of the supporters of the Government which happened to have the uppermost hand at the moment. In regard to this clause the Solicitor-General had taken them back to the topic they discussed a fortnight ago in Committee as Sunday closing, and in order that the House might fully appreciate this matter he would read the clause as it then stood—

"Premises in which intoxicating liquors are sold by retail shall be closed during the whole of Sunday except for one hour between noon and 3 p.m., and for any two hours between 6 p.m. and 10 p.m., those hours to be fixed as respects any licensing district by the licensing justices of the district."

He need not read the next four lines; and then came—

"This subsection shall not apply to premises in the Metropolitan district."

When the discussion on this clause took place in Committee three lines of argument were developed. The hon. Member for Scarborough contended that it was not fair to define the hours in the way in which they were defined in the clause, and that it would be better to leave some elasticity to the licensing authorities and to allow them to fix the post noon hours in the way most agreeable to the community. The second line of argument dealt with what would be the effect, on restaurants and hotels of this alteration of hours in the clause; and the third, what would be the effect of including the Metropolitan area in the new hours for in the course of a most interesting discussion, at a late hour in the afternoon the Under-Secretary to the Home Department had announced to the astonishment of a great many Members present that the Metropolitan area would follow the rest of the country.

What was the effect of all this? It was provided that premises in which intoxicating liquors were sold by retail should be closed during the whole of Sunday except for three hours between noon and 10 p.m., those hours to be fixed by the licensing justices of the district subject to the condition that one of the hours must be between noon and 3 p.m., and provided that, in the application of these times to the Metropolitan area, there should be substituted four hours for three hours and 11 p.m. for 10 p.m. The latest change now proposed by the Solicitor-General had been made in response to a universal outcry in the Metropolitan area on the part of hotels and restaurants, for the effect of the clause as first amended would have been to penalise the whole of the business of restaurants and hotels on Sundays. He would confine himself to the Metropolitan area. The open hours in that area at present were one to three o'clock and six to eleven o'clock. The effect of the clause as now amended would be to leave licensed houses open during those hours, not for the mere purpose of drinking, but for those who took a meal during those hours in a room set apart for the purpose. Outside those hours, licensing justices might fix twelve to one o'clock, and even to six o'clock, as the open hours for the sale of intoxicants. Thus from twelve to one a person would be in the bar. From one to three would be the hours for serving liquor with meals. From three to six o'clock the bar would be open again, for the licensing justices could fix any three hours they liked in the afternoon. From six to eleven o'clock the premises would be open again for meals, and intoxicating liquor taken with meals. That might be the effect of the new clause. Personally, he was a most abstemious man, not on account of conscience, but because intoxicating liquor did not suit his health. For many years past he had not attended bars except at railway stations, or when the House sat late. But he would imagine himself taking advantage of the new scale of hours. At twelve o'clock on Sunday he would go down to the bar of the "Criterion." He would talk to the lady behind the bar —because as the Bill at present stood the ladies were not to be excluded. They could discuss politics and the iniquities of the present Government, and that took up his Sunday hour between twelve and one o'clock. He was still on the "Criterion" premises, and then came one to three o'clock. He could occupy himself during those two hours in taking a meal and having intoxicating liquor with the meal. Between three and six o'clock the bar was open again; he had got three hours at the bar, which might or might not be more than he required. Between six and eleven o'clock the premises were open to him for meals with intoxicating liquors. Therefore, actually from mid-day on Sunday until eleven o'clock at night there was nothing to prevent him stopping during the whole of that period on the premises of the "Criterion." But there was more to come, because under subsection (2) of the new clause licensed premises might be open during closing hours except for the sale of non-intoxicants. This, he thought, was a concession to the bad law laid down by the Prime Minister a fortnight ago. The Prime Minister got into collision with the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University upon the subject of what might be done on licensed premises during closing hours. The Prime Minister thought it possible to have a cup of coffee and a sandwich, and he understood the right hon. Gentleman had done something of the kind himself. His hon. and learned friend thought that under the true reading of the Act of 1874, nothing of the kind could be done, and that to open licensed premises at all during closing hours was a breach of the law, although it did not carry a penalty. Sir Harry Poland appeared to have agreed rather with the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University than with the Prime Minister, and the result of that disagreement had been that the Government had put the matter beyond all doubt, and had amended the law according to this new clause. He would now proceed to show, when the "Criterion" closed at eleven o'clock on Sunday, what a man could do under this change in the law. He could remain upon the premises all through Sunday night asking for sandwiches and soda-water. He could stop there all night; there was nothing to prevent him. It was the exact effect of this new subsection. He would just sum up the position. He had been on the "Criterion" premises from twelve midday on Sunday till eleven o'clock at night. He then stopped on the premises and said: "Closing hours do not refer to me at all under the new exposition of the law," and he remained there all night asking for everything except intoxicants. He could ask for a devilled kidney, if the cook was kept up, and perhaps take a flask out of his pocket and drink his own whisky. It was not a parody of the position. All sorts of extraordinary complications arose as well. To begin with, what was a meal? He had looked in Chambers' Dictionary, which said that a square meal was a full meal. Evidently a "meal" was not a full meal. Was a sandwich a meal? In that connection they must take into account the idiosyncrasies of human beings. Some people took only a sandwich at lunch. In their case a sandwich would be a meal. If a "meal" was interpreted wrongly, the unfortunate restaurant-keeper risked losing his licence. A man might ask for a brandy-and-soda and a sandwich. The restaurant-keeper might reply, "Are you accustomed to consider a sandwich as a meal, because if you are not I may lose my licence if I serve you?" There was another point. The section said "taking a meal." Might they only have intoxicating liquor during those hours while they were actually taking a meal? Suppose they took a meal first and then their drink; a great many people did. Were they taking their drink in such a case during the meal or not? Let them take another case which would certainly arise, of a man having had a meal in a hotel and afterwards adjourning for coffee and liqueur to another room. Would he be able to take his liqueur in an adjoining room, or must he take it in the room where he had taken his meal? All these possible complications, upon which a licence depended, were flung, in the shape of this new clause, at their heads upon one of the last days on which the Bill would be before the House. The Government had had months and months to consider these questions. Before they interfered with the hours in the Metropolis they ought to have foreseen the consequences. He had put a Resolution on the Paper some time ago asking that the draftsman of the Bill should attend at the bar of the House in order to explain the Amendments. When he put that Resolution down he was not in any way throwing any doubt upon the ability or industry of that gentleman, who had had an impossible task imposed upon him. The Government changed their mind and their Bill from day to day. One day they put an Amendment on the Paper and the next day withdrew it, and another day they put it back again, until there was no man in the House who knew what the position was except that it was an intolerable one.

MR. JAMES HOPE said the hon. Member for York had covered the ground fairly completely, and he did not know that he could touch upon anything very new, but he would like to put to the Government what a very difficult position a publican would be in on a Sunday. He recognised that this was a concession, but he thought before they accepted it they must know something more about its actual working. There would be three different periods on a Sunday. There would be a period in which anyone could go into a house and obtain non-alcoholic refreshment; then a period in which anyone could obtain alcoholic refreshment without taking a meal; and a third period in which a person could go into a house and take alcoholic refreshment with a meal. He submitted that breaking the day up into those three periods would make the business of the publican on Sunday one of extreme difficulty, and one which would be added to in this way. The clause said—

> "During any hours on which these premises might have been open on Sunday for the sale of intoxicating liquor before the passing of this Act."

Assuming the Act to have been working for some years, he thought the average licence-holder would forget the state of the law before the passing of this Act, and he might easily be led into a slight slip by forgetting what the old hours were, and that would cost him his licence. He submitted that the hours during which the alcohol, plus meal, could be taken ought to be set down in the subsection. The hon. Member for York had asked what was a meal. Well, there was a very great difficulty. Theologians for the purposes of the law of fasting had defined a meal as more than eight ounces of solid food. Were the Government prepared to accept that definition? If so, a man would have to buy solid food to the extent of eight ounces, which would have to be weighed, and until it had been weighed he would not get his alcoholic refreshment. If the Government did not accept that definition he did not know what definition they could adopt. He presumed that a biscuit to cover a whisky and soda would not be a meal. Would a sandwich be a meal? Would it be necessary for a man taking a sandwich to sit down at a table, or could he take the sandwich standing at a bar? These points must arise, and unless some definition was inserted in the Bill the utmost confusion and difficulty would result. Then he came to the words "in a room set apart for the purpose." If he were an unscrupulous man he would set apart a room, not a very large one, in a corner of which he would put a ham, which need not be too new, and an open tin of "jungle pig" from Chicago, with knives and forks and the rest, and that obviously would be a room for the ostensible purpose of eating. Anyone going into that room would be able to sit down and perhaps have a piece of ham and so get a drink with it. In this way he believed that the intention of the clause would be absolutely evaded, and it would be a matter of extreme difficulty to get a conviction in consequence. He did not know whether the Government had really thought out what was the actual meaning of "eating a meal." He believed that it would be quite possible for a publican so long as the room was ostensibly set apart, and so long as some eating was going on, to arrange in such a way that it would be impossible to prove that anybody that he supplied with liquor had not taken a meal, and unless that could be proved the whole intent of the subsection was defeated. Then he came to subsection (2). The law might be as Sir Harry Poland said, or it might be what the Solicitor-General had said, but it had not been so understood. It was not so understood, he believed, by the hon. Member for Skipton, because he remembered that there was a case heard at Keighley in which the hon. Member for Skipton was sitting on the bench. Two men were convicted and fined for taking ginger ale on a Sunday morning in a public-house. Certainly it had been understood hitherto that no one was to open his house during closing hours, and in some cases prosecutions had followed a breach of what was supposed to be the law. All that was to be changed, and under this subsection licensed premises might be kept open day or night, on Sunday or weekday, at any time, so long as they were not open for the purpose of selling alcoholic liquor. That opened the door to very great possibilities. He did not suppose that many publicans would wish to keep their houses open day and night, but once competition began it would be very hard for them not to fall in, and they would be exposed to the greatest possible difficulties. For instance, if they wanted to turn a man off their premises, and he said: "No; I wish to remain, but not for the purpose of taking intoxicating liquor, I know that the hours for obtaining intoxicating liquors are passed, but I want a cup of coffee," how would the landlord be able to get rid of him? He did not see how, unless the landlord shut up the house altogether. If that were not done a man might sit all through the night until next morning. A man might remain on the premises with intoxicating liquor before him, but how was it to be proved that it had been supplied before or after eleven o'clock. He did not know whether hon. Members knew the Café Bauer in Berlin, but the proud boast was made about it that it had never once been closed since it was first opened. He submitted that under this section it would be perfectly possible for that to happen, and all sorts of abuses would arise; he need not tell them what the consequences would be; hon. Members could easily tell for themselves. If cafés and licensed premises were to be open all through the night, whatever construction they put on the sale of intoxicating liquor, it was very easy to understand what abuses would follow in their train. As his hon. friend had pointed out, a man might take his own liquor into a public-house after hours, and he might ask for a soda or seltzer to mix with his whiskey. The man did not go there for the purpose of getting alcoholic liquor, but for the purpose of obtaining soda. Of course, the man really went there for the purpose of getting alcohol in the form of a mixture. It would be very easy for a man in collusion with another to go into a licensed house with a flask already filled with alcoholic liquor and order a soda or seltzer to be added to it, and in that way they could have a merry symposium together afterwards. These were not improbable cases; they were cases which would really and truly occur unless the Government made some modification of the clause, which certainly could not be accepted as it stood.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he wished to remove a misconception as to the object of this clause. First of all, with regard to the second subsection to which the hon. Member directed his concluding observations. That subsection, in their opinion, was really declaratory of the law as it at present stood. He had ventured some weeks ago to state what he conceived to be the law. He quite admitted that he was no authority on the subject at present, at any rate, and he was glad to find that his hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General, who was an authority, was in agreement with him. As to the Government's version of the law, it was true that it had been disputed by that very high authority, his learned friend Sir Harry Poland, whose authority was certainly second to none on matters of this kind. They were, however, able to fortify their view that theirs was the correct interpretation of the Licensing Acts, and there could be no question whatsoever about it unless the decision to which his hon. and learned friend had referred was wrong; at any rate, it had never been over-ruled. There was no question whatever that they had correctly interpreted the law, and that this clause was really an exposition of the law, not as it ought to be, not as it might be under some changed conditions and circumstances, but as it actually was and had been for the last thirty years or more. Therefore, all the difficulties raised by the hon. Gentleman applied equally to the existing state of things. There was nothing new, no new development of any sort or kind in this second subsection. The strongest misconceptions seemed to prevail as to the obligations of holders of licences for the supply of refreshments. According to the law of the country if a man held himself out as an innkeeper, he kept an inn which was subject to the common and ordinary obligation to supply refreshments to customers at all reasonable times. When a man was not an innkeeper, but merely the holder of a licence for the sale of intoxicating liquors he was under no such obligation, and he could close his house when he liked. To suppose that this subsection, which was merely declaratory of the existing law, imposed upon persons who were not innkeepers the obligation to provide persons with non-intoxicants at all hours of the day was a completely ridiculous interpretation of the law. The subsection made no change whatever in the law. It merely cleared up a doubt as to the exact interpretation of the existing law. The other subsection dealt with Sunday opening. Here again the hon. Members for Sheffield and York, if he might say so with respect, had somewhat misdirected their undoubted ingenuity in raising spectres that were never likely to be encountered in actual practice. The provisions of the subsection were simplicity itself. What did they come to? They came to this. They said that for the purpose of drinking, and drinking merely, the hours of Sunday opening should be curtailed and reduced to three hours, and in London to four hours. But in order to get rid of the hardship which was much insisted upon, and which he thought was felt quite as much on one side of the House as on the other, namely, the hardship imposed upon restaurants, not only those which catered for the rich, but those which catered for the poor—and there were a great many of these in London and our large towns—it was felt that some elasticity should be introduced to provide for the case of people who took meals on Sunday and took drink with those meals, even though the time at which they took them should not fall within one of the three or the four hours permitted for drinking. Therefore, he did not think this was a concession, although it had been so described; giving way to common sense was not a concession; it was a provision which he thought had the general assent of the House, that the law should remain as it was. Provided that a man went to the house to get a meal, what possible difficulty was there about saying what was a meal? It was a pure question of fact. All these imaginary cases about the *bona fide* sandwiches and so forth, would not arise when the matter came to be submitted to the common sense decision of a magistrate or a jury. So again, with the infinitely mythical problems which suggested themselves to the hon. Member for Sheffield with regard to the setting aside of a room for the purpose of eating. Could anything be plainer than the intention of that? What was intended was that they must close the bar. They must have a room honestly set apart for the purpose of eating, and if the hon. Member or his friends tried any of those devices with stale hams and all the rest of the apparatus of deception which the hon. Member almost invited them to set up for the purpose of fraud and for the purpose of providing litigation for the amusement of the Court, he could assure them the law would continue to be administered by the light of common sense, and they would not escape conviction. That was the whole object and scope of this clause. It was in no sense revolutionary. So far as it was declaratory, it stated the law as it was at present, and so far as it amended the law, it made ample provision for the requirements of social life.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said it was with some trepidation that he ventured to touch upon the question of what was supposed to be the law according to the declaration contained in the clause, and what had been supposed to be the law up to the present in regard to the opening of public-houses during prohibited hours. He had not practical experience of the working of the English licensing law, but the sections of the Irish Acts were identical with those which had prevailed for so many years in this country; and in the exercise of his profession he had become familiar with them. Although Ireland was so notorious for its sobriety that it was excluded from any of the provisions of this Bill, nevertheless they had had cases which raised the questions they were considering. He could not at all agree with the view of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite that the controversy as regarded the position of publicans during prohibited hours and the right to open or close their premises had been disposed of by the case to which he had referred. As he understood that case, it was a prosecution against a spirit grocer under the section which imposed a penalty for selling or exposing for sale intoxicating liquors during certain hours. He should have thought that the moment the spirit grocer opened his premises on which he had spirits exposed for sale, he committed an offence under that section, and he confessed he hardly thought it required the great ability of Mr. Justice Mellor or of Lord Justice Field to decide that. How could such a case be regarded for a moment as an authority on the question as to what was the position of a publican who was ordered by Act of Parliament to keep closed during certain hours? It had always been understood to be the law, and the law had been acted upon in that sense by the licensed trade in Ireland, that during prohibited hours they were not at liberty to open their premises for any purpose—food or otherwise—except to a *bona fide* traveller. He could not quite follow the criticism passed by the hon. and learned Gentleman on the contribution made on this subject by Sir Harry Poland, because Sir Harry Poland's point was that where they had an express statutory declaration that the premises were to be closed during a certain period, if the premises were open in defiance of the statutory declaration an offence was committed at common law which could be made a subject of indictment. The hon. and learned Gentleman's answer to that was that at common law they could not indict a man for an offence if there was a penalty imposed by statute. Sir Harry Poland's point was that in this case admittedly there was no penalty imposed as a result of infringing the statutory prohibition against opening, and therefore the only way to enforce the statutory prohibition was by indictment at common law. But there was another method by which the general popular view, which undoubtedly prevailed, certainly at home, and he believed in this country upon this question, namely, that the publican should not, during closed hours, open the premises for any purpose, was enforced, namely, at renewal sessions, because if there was any proof whatever that during the closing hours the publican was in the habit of opening his doors and keeping his premises open, no matter how *bona fide* his purpose might have been, in many cases the magistrates regarded that as misconduct, and refused to renew the licence. He quite agreed that, if that doubt existed as to the state of the law, it was desirable to clear it up, but he thought the Government had taken the wrong course, because he believed it would be infinitely better in the interests of morality and the proper conduct of these places that during prohibited hours in which Parliament said they were not to be open, they should not be allowed to be open for any purpose, and he could conceive no greater machinery for the violation of the law than this new declaration to publicans all over England. Notwithstanding any provision in any Act of Parliament that they were to keep them closed during a certain period, nevertheless they were now told for the first time that the law had been, and that the intention of this Government was that, in the future, they were to be at liberty to keep their premises open during prohibited hours at night, and throughout Sunday, the only restriction upon them being that while they could keep their premises open they were not in fact to sell drink. A vast machinery of supervision and espionage would be required to carry out the law. Even though the decision referred to might have the effect pointed out by the hon. and learned Gentleman it had never been so understood even in this country, and a remarkable proof of that was that during the course of the debate a few weeks ago, it was never once hinted at. Sir Harry Poland did not seem to give it that effect. They had now in this subsection a declaration from the Government to the licensing trade throughout England that notwithstanding anything which might be in any Act of Parliament, they were at liberty to keep their licensed premises open, their shutters down, their shop door open, their men behind the counter, and all they had to do when the police came in during prohibited hours was to say: "We have kept them open in case some casual wayfarer should drop in in order to get his breakfast on his way to Church or his dinner on his way to evening service." The thing would lead to endless and hopeless evasion of the law, and it would be found impossible to overcome it. A loophole was given by this subsection such as had never previously existed for evading the present provisions of the law with regard to Sunday closing and early closing. The first portion of the subsection was open to many of the observations addressed to the Committee by the hon. Member for York. He believed it would increase infinitely the labour of the police in London and almost paralyse hotel-keepers and restaurants in the conduct of their business, because at one stage of the day they would be ordinary hotel-keepers without a licence; a few minutes afterwards they would be full-fledged licensed publicans; in another hour they would go back to their former position, and all that was to depend upon the hands of the clock. Neither police nor hotel-keeper would know at any particular moment what was the exact legal position of the hotel-keeper or the parties who were frequenting his premises. He most strongly protested in the interest of true temperance against this new declaration by which all licensed persons were told for the first time that they were to be at liberty to keep their houses open all day and all night if they so chose, notwithstanding any provision in any Act of Parliament to the contrary.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said he did not for a moment pretend to accept the invitation of the Solicitor-General to instruct him in the law. Let him assume that the law was as the Solicitor-General said it was. He did not think that that settled the question, because the real question was whether the practice would not be altered. If it had been the law in the past it nevertheless certainly had not been understood to be the law, and if this clause now appeared in an Act of

Parliament they would be giving the trade an announcement which would certainly alter the practice. He did not personally object to the first sub-clause. He thought it might be a reasonable concession, though there was one loophole for evasion there which he hoped might be stopped. But it was rather in reference to the second sub-clause that he wished to speak. Did this deal with the law dealing with unlicensed refreshment houses? They were forbidden under the Act of 1864 to sell either alcoholic refreshments or refreshments of any kind after a certain hour. He did not clearly know whether this affected their case or not. The Act of 1864 under which that prohibition rested on them was not mentioned as one of the Licensing Acts. The Act of 1874 which referred again to the question was mentioned as one of the Licensing Acts. As they were having a general clear statement of the case they wanted an answer whether the case of the unlicensed refreshment houses was dealt with or not. It certainly was required to. If they were going to allow licensed premises to sell non-alcoholic refreshments they ought to allow refreshment houses which were unlicensed to sell non-alcoholic refreshments at the same time. As to the general policy of the clause he was in some sympathy with the desire that licensed premises should provide non-alcoholic refreshment as well as alcoholic. That was the general wish of the House, he thought, and it was carried out by one of the few good points in the Act of 1904, under which an obligation was placed upon licence-holders to supply non-alcoholic refreshments. But was it really necessary to allow people to remain during prohibited hours on licensed premises at night for that purpose and did not this clause clearly allow it? It seemed to him that that point had not been met in any way. Surely men might stay on after closing hours, and if their presence was challenged by the police all they had to say was they were not there to consume alcoholic refreshments but to get non-alcoholic refreshments, and they could remain there for any length of time. He believed the object of the closing regulations was partly to make some limit upon the hours during which alcoholic liquors might be consumed and partly to stop the practice, which was certainly common before the closing regulations, of people staying in licensed premises practically all night which he did not think even the trade wanted. The Solicitor-General said it would be dangerous for the licence-holder to allow people to go into his house during prohibited hours, but it was easy to get a dozen people to swear to what was necessary for the purpose of defence. The clause would lead to any quantity of plausible evasion. It would have been quite sufficient to allow people to go in during closing hours on Sundays for the purpose of getting non-alcoholic refreshments but certainly not at night. Though perhaps merely a declaratory clause, not altering the law, it might alter the practice very seriously and lead to a state of things which it would be exceedingly difficult afterwards to remedy.

*MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said that this was not a question of nicety in legal interpretation, but as to what the House intended should be the practice of the law in the future. He found himself in agreement with the view of the hon. Member that the Amendment before the House was not an interpretation of the law as at present administered. He did not doubt that there was some difficulty in the exact legal interpretation of the law of closing as it stood now, but the point which the House had to decide upon was how it wished the law to stand in future. The present law in practice was clear. At present licensed premises were closed at a certain fixed hour, and if they were not the publican was liable to be prosecuted and to have complaints formulated against him by the police when next he made an application for the renewal of his licence. But it was a complete revolution of the law as it now existed to lay down that there should be no limitation of hours for the supply of refreshments and non-intoxicating liquors. That was an entire change of the law as it stood except in the one case of innkeepers. Innkeepers' licences were taken out by the keepers of hotels for the accommodation of travellers, where travellers could not only obtain the refreshment they needed, but also a night's rest. Most licensed premises had not refreshment licences; the vast majority held alehouse licences. The hon. Member for Lincoln had very properly pointed out that there was an obligation on the ordinary licence-holder to supply refreshments of a non-intoxicating character. There was a clause in the Act of 1904 which empowered the justices to refuse to renew a licence where a licensee had refused to supply refreshments other than intoxicating liquor at a reasonable price. Under those circumstances the licence could be refused renewal on the ground that the premises had not been properly conducted. This section imposed a most stringent penalty if a publican refused to supply refreshments of a non-intoxicating character when called upon to do so. How was this section going to be carried out with unlimited hours? He was sure there had been confusion in the mind of the Government when they drew up this clause, for one serious difficulty had been overlooked and had not been brought very prominently before the House. If these unlimited hours and other obligations were to be forced upon the publicans and other keepers of these houses, what was to become of the servants and the barmaids if they were to be liable to be called upon at any hour of the day or night to supply refreshments?

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): There is no such obligation.

*MR. GRETTON said he had given reasons for this statement. If obligations under this new clause were to lie on the licence-holder as to unlimited hours of opening, what was to become of those who were in their employment, such as barmaids and others? How was the licence-holder to get any rest, or his employees a night's sleep? The whole position required most careful and serious consideration, and he regarded the clause as a retrograde move. It was a retrograde policy which the Government were pursuing, and was contrary to all the other legislation which had been adopted by Parliament to limit the hours of labour. The greatest difficulty would arise in the work of practical administration, both with the licence-holder and the police, in differentiating the periods when houses should be legally open for the supply of liquor and when they should be open for the sale of refreshments and non-intoxicating drink. The licence-holder would not know where he was, and the police officers would have the greatest difficulties thrust upon them in carrying out their duties. Anyone with experience of the licensing law must know that this clause would lead to most vexatious, costly, and difficult litigation. He could see the greatest difficulties in the way of carrying out the proposal of the Government. It was clear they had not examined carefully the present law. For these reasons he felt it obligatory on him to vote against the clause.

*MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock) appealed to the Government to withdraw this new clause, or at any rate a portion of it. The clause did not appear to be popular on either side of the House. [Cries of dissent.] Well, he had heard a good many speeches, but with the exception of those delivered from the front bench, none were in its favour, and he appealed to the Government to withdraw it. One of the objects of the Bill—and a very important object—was to restrict the amount of Sunday drinking, but this clause would check the full restrictions which the Government proposed by the Bill to place on Sunday drinking. There would be immense difficulty in carrying out the proposals in the clause as well as in making an attempt to differentiate the period of time when the houses should supply the one form of refreshment or the other. The houses were to be closed, but in a room set apart for the purpose, liquor with meals could be taken. It would be extremely difficult to say where the "house" ended and the "room" began. There was not only a question of geography, but also one of history, because the public and the publican would have to find out what it was that the law really meant. It would not be a question of the law as to closing as it then was, but as it had been previously. Then it would be extremely hard to define a "meal." It might be possible for a man to demand an alcoholic drink, and at the same time to take a biscuit. Again, did the Government mean a "solid meal" or a "liquid meal." If the latter, soup might be allowed, and it would be possible for a large amount of alcohol to be introduced into the soup. This clause was not framed in the interests of temperance but to meet the outcry which came from certain people who were interested in fashionable London restaurants. Why should the whole country suffer on that account? Therefore, in the interest of temperance he appealed most strongly to the Government to consider whether they could not withdraw, at any rate, a great portion of the clause.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said his hon. friend had made an appeal to the Government in the name of temperance, but his remarks were not couched in what he regarded as a temperance spirit. He submitted that it was the extreme spirit which was displayed by such hon. Gentlemen as the hon. Member for the Tavistock Division and the hon. Member for Lincoln which made it difficult to bring about temperance reform. Those hon. Gentlemen would accept no palliative of this description—nothing which rendered the Act easy and possible of fulfilment. It was their refusal to accept any Amendment of this character which jeopardised the Bill and made it more easy for it to be lost in another place. If hon. Gentlemen wished to see the Bill become law, they had better accept anything which the Government put in by way of Amendment in this direction. Nobody could accuse the Government of being backward in bringing forward this temperance Bill or in the cause of temperance reform. Hon. Members opposite had been complaining all along that the Bill was much too strong, and now when a reasonable concession to public feeling was proposed, obstacles were put in the way of passing it and the opposition opposed just as they had, when the Bill was made stiffer. Did hon. Members opposite and on his side who were objecting to the new clause think that everybody who went into a public-house went there for the purpose of getting drunk? Presumably, they acted on the principle that no good thing could come from the Government. Why was there to be no room for the reasonable moderate man who wanted to drink wine or other alcoholic beverages? He was glad that some hon. Members opposite, however, had not taken up a fanatical attitude on this subject. Supposing that one man did drink a little too much, was it right on that account that the many should go hungry because they could not get into licensed houses to have food and a moderate amount of drink? Were they to be debarred from proper opportunities of getting refreshment in order to satisfy the views of those who saw something inherently wicked in wine and other liquors apart from the immoderate use of them? He should have thought that the hon. Member for Rutland would have supported the clause, and he was amazed when he found that he objected to it. He thought the hon. Gentleman's objection could only proceed, in the Parliamentary sense of course, and without offence, from party spirit. The hon. Member for the Tavistock Division asked—What is a meal? He (Mr. Rees) had been to Finland, where this temperance arrangement of no meal, no drink, had admittedly worked with great success. He had himself come under the law in that country; he had been told that he could not have a drink of any sort, however moderate, after a hard ride or walk, without ordering a meal. An hon. Member had suggested that a person who wanted drink would order soup, and then fill it up with whisky. That would be extremely disgusting, and it was nonsense to talk of that being done. In Finland, people knew perfectly well what was the spirit of the law, and that they were bound to obey it. There seemed to be no kind of reason in the objection to the clause, and, therefore, so far from urging the Government to withdraw it, he congratulated them on bringing it forward.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said the speech of the Solicitor-General was one of extreme importance. He had made it perfectly plain that the law was not what everyone had understood it to be for many years. Public-houses were supposed to be partially closed on Sundays. He thought it was a very serious thing that the country should realise that public-houses were now practically to be opened on all occasions on Sundays. He was one of those who last week voted in favour of the Sunday closing provision. He looked at this subject purely from two points of view—one was the Sabbatarian and the other that which he had just raised. Supposing that at the present time a publican desired to go away from his public-house with his wife and family for the day it was allowable for him to do so. But if, as the Solicitor-General said, it was not permitted to the publican to refuse to supply non-alcoholic drink on Sunday it was quite impossible for him to go away from the public-house and leave it unattended. According to the Solicitor-General, it would be an indictable offence if the publican did not supply non-alcoholic liquor when wanted.

SIR S. EVANS: That is the common law with respect to innkeepers.

MR. PIKE PEASE had no intention of giving the idea that he was attributing to the Solicitor-General something which he did not say. At any rate, the ordinary village inn was bound to supply food at any time on Sunday whether in or out of closing hours.

SIR S. EVANS: That is the law now.

MR. PIKE PEASE said that was not the law as now understood in the country. If inquiry were made in any village it would be found that there was a certain time when these public-houses were absolutely closed, and none of the public were allowed to go in. It was plain that many people who did not work on Sundays at present would, if the Bill was passed into law, be required to work on that day. There would then be more wants in regard to food and non-alcoholic beverages. It was a mistake to say that such a subsection as this would induce the House of Lords to pass this measure. He thought it would have exactly the opposite effect.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said his hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General must be a little surprised at the course the debate had taken because it had dealt mainly with subsection (2) of the new clause, which was put in entirely at the instigation of hon. Members opposite.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I think it was put in to explain the position of the law as stated by the Prime Minister on this particular point.

*MR. LEIF JONES: Quite so—at the request of the Opposition.

MR. YOUNGER: No request whatever.

*MR. LEIF JONES: I am speaking from memory, but I think the Prime Minister stated the law, and it was challenged on the other side by the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge, who asked that some declaratory clause should be put in the Bill to make the law clear.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): I challenged across the floor the statement as to the law which was given by the Prime Minister. I said I did not know technically, but that I knew practically what it was. I have made inquiry since, and I understand the law in a contrary sense to that stated by the Prime Minister. I then put in a written Question, simply asking what the Government intended to do upon the point, and the Home Secretary courteously replied that he proposed to put in a subsection declaratory of the existing law. But it certainly was not at my request in any way.

*MR. LEIF JONES said that as the result of what happened in the Committee stage, the Government put in this explanatory clause giving their view of the law, and he understood that their view was that this clause was wholly unnecessary. The Government regarded it in that way, and the Opposition did not welcome it, and he therefore ventured to ask the Government to withdraw it. The defence of the Solicitor-General was that the law was perfectly clear at present, and that they were merely stating in words what was the law. When eminent legal authorities disputed one with another as to its meaning he did not know how it could be said that it was perfectly clear. The object of the Government was not to change the law, but whether they changed it or not there seemed to be the gravest danger that they were going to change the practice. The change was not desired by anybody. The present practice had worked fairly satisfactorily on the whole. That was not disputed. They had not been inundated with complaints from travellers and others as to the past working of the law. From a police point of view, it was extremely undesirable that any change should be made. He ventured to say that if a conference of all the chief constables in the country were called, the unanimous verdict on the subject would be against inserting this subsection. The instructions given to the police were to see that there were no strangers on licensed premises during the prohibited hours. If they were there, they must explain the reason of their presence to the police; and if they could not give a good account of themselves, the police had instructions to arrest the strangers. If this subsection were carried, the police throughout the country would have to be increased in order to see that the law was observed. He hoped that he had shown that there was no demand for this subsection. No one in the House wanted it. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"!] Well, no one who had spoken in the debate except the hon. Member for Montgomeryshire had asked that the clause should be read a second time, and therefore he advised the Government to withdraw it. There were one or two observations he wished to make with regard to the first subsection. The first was as to the meal, which he thought was not quite so simple a matter as the lawyers imagined. As a matter of fact, it was more a matter of practice than of law. The hon. Member for Montgomeryshire had told them that he had no difficulty in regard to the matter.

*MR. REES said that what he had stated was that where the provision existed there was no difficulty in carrying it out.

*MR. LEIF JONES said that there he agreed with the hon. Member. If there was no specification of what a meal was, then a meal might become only a pretence for obtaining a drink. At any rate, the result would be that an easy means of evading the law would be provided by this subsection. Further—and he asked the special attention of the Committee to this point—he was very much afraid that under subsection (1) the practice of treating might be increased. [AN HON. MEMBER on the OPPOSITION benches: Good gracious!] Now, treating was one of the great practical evils of the licensing system. Every temperance worker knew the evils that arose from treating. He had been told more than once that if they could stop treating they would do more for temperance reform than anything in this Bill. He submitted that under subsection (1) treating might go on during the closing hours. There was no limit to the amount of liquor to be supplied to a person ordering a meal. Supposing he went into a public-house during the prohibited hours with half a dozen friends and ordered a meal and with it a gallon of beer. Supposing he poured the beer out to his friends and only ate a biscuit, there would be seven people who could go on consuming intoxicating liquor during the prohibited hours without any evasion of subsection (1) as it now stood. So much did he feel this that he had put down an Amendment to make it clear that the liquor to be supplied should be exclusively for the consumption of the person ordering the meal. He might be told that that was a fanciful evil; but it was very important that in legislation of this kind they should block every possible loophole. He did not say that publicans were more unscrupulous than other people. He knew that the publicans were a chosen people, specially selected for a licence on the ground of character; but it was asking too much of them when it was said that they would not take advantage of a loophole in an Act of Parliament which was passed for the purpose of restricting their operations. Therefore, he hoped that the Government would accept his Amendment on this point. He only wanted to say as a last word that, while he was opposed to the clause as a whole, still he thought that the difficulties in relation to London restaurants and eating houses called for special dealing; but this did not in the least justify subsection (2); and he hoped that the Government would be induced to withdraw subsection (2) and amend subsection (1) so as to meet the views expressed from every section of the House.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) said they were all willing to attribute to the Government the best possible intentions, but after considering this clause with care, he confessed that he did not think that they had been very happy in giving effect to their good intentions. The clause was both complicated and vague. The licensing laws were at present surrounded with sufficient pitfalls and difficulties, but these would be increased in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. Under this clause there were to be four periods in the course of the week in which the legal sale of liquor would vary. The first was what they might call the new Sunday hours, during which intoxicants and non-intoxicants could be sold to all persons in or out of a special room set apart for serving meals. Then there was a period representing the difference between the new Sunday hours and what might be called the ante-1908 Sunday hours, during which the publican might sell on six days of the week intoxicants, but on Sundays he might not sell intoxicants except in a room specially set apart with a meal. Then he might sell intoxicants during the ordinary week-days during the prescribed hours. Then there was this new strange period outside the ordinary recognised week-day hours, during which it was now to be made plain that he might have guests on his premises provided he did not supply them with intoxicating liquors. He could not help thinking that this clause was unduly and unnecessarily complex. He did not share the optimism of the Prime Minister about a meal and a room. It appeared to him that the first subsection invited evasion, and would go far to justify that evasion in public opinion. He had been told—he did not know with what truth—that in certain parts of the United States, where some rule analogous to this obtained, a sandwich went very far in covering up with its solid respectability the purchase and sale of intoxicating liquors. He had heard of a sandwich which had chaperoned a large number of such transactions, extending over a period of months, until at last it was inadvertently consumed by a customer in an absent-minded moment. There would be a difficulty about the meal—he was quite positive about that—and in the further double restriction as to the room set apart for the purpose of supplying the meal. What was going to happen in a case, very familiar in London, of a place where there was a large apartment in which there were a great number of tables where genuine meals were served with drinks, and where there was a bar across which solid meals were also served with drinks? Was that to be regarded as a real genuine room set apart for the service of meals? Great difficulties would arise, he was afraid, with regard to that point. He could not help thinking that this clause would work out in favour of large and against small establishments unable to provide a separate room. But his main difficulty with regard to the optimistic observations of the Prime Minister on this matter, was not legal but practical. The great difficulty was that on a question of law the matter could be settled once for all, but when it was a question of fact that was a question for the tribunal to decide. One tribunal might well say that what was served was a meal, and another tribunal might say that it was not; so that the licensed victualler would never know what a local tribunal would decide as to what was a meal. It was the uncertainty of making this an issue of fact that troubled his mind. The second subsection was very important. This was not the place to indulge in a disquisition as to whether or not that subsection accurately set out the existing law. He himself had considerable doubts as to whether it did. But the Prime Minister had spoken, not only as to the law as it was at present, but the law as it ought to be. He understood that the Government was not only interested in the licensing law as it was, but were much more interested in the licensing law as it ought to be; and he was surprised that it should have been reserved for this Government to make it clear that it was the law, if it were the law, that public houses could be kept open at all hours of the day, provided that no intoxicants were sold. He assumed that the police had an equal legal right to visit the public-houses both inside and outside the prohibited hours; but there would be the great difficulty about the intoxicating drink which was brought into the house before the prohibited hours. He asked the Solicitor-General how they were to deal under this second subsection with that case. They knew now that when the closing time came the revellers were ejected from the licensed premises, and they sometimes went home. What was to prevent persons presenting themselves with a flask of whisky or other intoxicating spirit, buying soda water, or helping themselves to water, and sitting in a licensed house drinking till all hours of the night? The men might come in before closing time, and sit and drink there till that hour was reached. What was to prevent them from sitting in the public-house and consuming a bottle of whisky, which they had lawfully bought at a proper time for hours afterwards? At places like the Savoy when the proper time came they were turned out, but what would happen if this law was passed? The managers did not want to offend their guests by turning them out, and so far as he could see, the licensed places, high and low, would remain open and practically, if not technically, sell intoxicating liquors at all hours of the night.

SIR S. EVANS said that such a case would be a breach of the existing law, which prohibited the consumption on licensed premises after hours of intoxicating liquor purchased before hours.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER thought it was serious and startling that a Liberal Government should make this proposal, and in conclusion he would say this one thing. Those who worked on licensed premises were very hard worked people; they worked long and irregular hours. Would it not add greatly to the hardship of their lives, to pass a clause which encouraged licensed persons to remain open all night? It would have a disastrous effect upon the employees, and for that reason he thought they must regard the whole of this clause with considerable disfavour.

*MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) earnestly hoped that the Government would not withdraw either portion of this new clause, which seemed to him to be one of the very few reasonable concessions to public liberty for which they had had to thank the Government in the course of this discussion. All the Government proposed under subsection (1) was to leave things exactly as they were at present, and people who dined or lunched out on Sunday, a habit which was growing very extensively in this country, would still be at liberty to do so. But for this first subsection as the Bill was framed it would be impossible for anybody to go out to lunch or dinner or invite others to join them in doing so on Sunday. Sunday was already dull enough. After a few hours spent in church there was nothing else to do, and consequently he desired to tender his thanks to the Government for, with regard to meals on licensed premises, leaving Sunday unimpaired by the Bill. He thought this was a most valuable concession on the part of the Government. Assuming as he did that the views of the Solicitor-General were correct, everybody in the world now knew that licensed premises might be opened at any portion of the day or night for the supply of non-alcoholic drinks and refreshments, and he should tell his friend the manager of the Savoy if he was there to-night that he need not close at half past twelve but could give them a reasonable time for taking their suppers, without inconvenience or the risk of indigestion. He had always thought it a scandal to civilisation that respectable people who had been to the theatre or the opera, could not get an opportunity of having a little supper in a licensed restaurant or hotel in comfort and peace, because of the absurd and the antiquated view of the law which had hitherto prevailed, that they must clear out at half-past twelve o'clock. One might have ladies or friends with one and want to get a little supper and not wish to get it when arriving home at one or two o'clock in the morning, and as the law was interpreted now the restaurants turned people out before they had finished their suppers. He did not know whether he was entitled to claim the credit from the Government of being the real author of this subsection. Some dispute arose about it, and the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge disclaimed any authorship, but he thought he had on the Paper a clause which was not reached—nothing was reached—empowering licensed restaurants to remain open for half an hour longer than they did at present. In his darkness then he supposed they had to close, but it was the spirit of that Amendment which was embodied in this clause, and he rejoiced accordingly. He would point out that although subsection (1) of the Government clause required that the meals should be taken in a room set apart for the purpose there was no such provision in subsection (2), and consequently anybody could obtain non-alcoholic refreshment at any hour of the day and night in a room not set apart from others. Subsection (2) therefore declared the law to be that people might take non-alcoholic refreshment at any hour of the day or night, and there was no restriction as to any part of the building in which they could take it. He, for one, as a real temperance reformer, did not want to encourage facilities for bar drinking at any hour of the day or night, but he did want to reserve the right in a *bona fide* restaurant to finish a meal under circumstances of decency; and if the Government would insert a few words to make it clear that this right of the licensed victualler to supply non-alcoholic refreshment in "closed" hours should be in a part set apart for ordinary restaurant purposes, he should raise no objection. In subsection (2) they spoke only of refreshment other than intoxicating liquors, and that might mean only refreshments in a liquid sense. He was not a lawyer, but he thought he might argue if he were that the section empowered a licensed person to supply refreshments other than intoxicating liquor but that the refreshment must be in a liquid form, provided it was not intoxicating. He thought the intention was that people should obtain any reasonable refreshment after licensed hours. He considered it was a great deal that they had got this declaration, and he hoped the Government would not withdraw it. They had withdrawn quite enough. Let them be firm about something. This was a declaration which everyone using restaurants should be very glad to see. The law had been declared, and let them all understand it in future. The point of view upon which he desired to support the subsection was that people who went out to supper, as many of them did nowadays, should have an opportunity of enjoying their meals in peace and comfort. He had the honour of having a visitor from France. They had been enjoying their evening in the most reasonable, rational, and pleasant manner by listening to music. They had hardly sat down to supper when a vulgar voice said they must get out, at which his French friend expressed astonishment. They went to another portion of the premises where he took a bedroom, which he had not the slightest intention of using, and they partook of their meal in peace. The present practice did not inspire respect for the law, and he asked the Government to adhere to their declarations and show that in some respects they were alive to the requirements of the people who wished to enjoy the ordinary elements of liberty, at least, where their stomachs were concerned.

Mr. YOUNGER was understood to say that personally he was one of those who were committed to a modification of Sunday hours of opening as contained in the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, a position from which he did not recede in the slightest degree. Therefore, so far as this proposal gave effect to what was proposed in that Report and did not go beyond it, he had no remarks to offer. He suspected, however, as the clause would stand if the Solicitor-General's Amendments to other parts of the Bill were accepted, as he presumed they would be by this House, that it would be open to the justices to fix the three hours of opening in the country between twelve and three and not to allow the houses to open at all between six and ten. He was perfectly certain that went outside the recommendations, the intention of which was that there should be one hour for the supply of dinner beer, and certain hours for the reasonable refreshment which people were in the habit of getting in the evening.

SIR S. EVANS said the intention was for the justices to be allowed to fix two or three hours in the afternoon in special cases: for instance, in a watering-place, where it might be that there was no desire or necessity to open in the evening, the houses might be allowed to be open for more than two hours in the afternoon. That was the reason why it was made elastic in this way and left to the discretion of the justices.

MR. YOUNGER said his suspicion appeared to be well founded. He thought in some sort of way people ought to be guarded against the abuse of that discretion by the justices. He thought there should be some evening as well as afternoon opening. As to leaving restaurants in the position in which they were now, he thought everyone would agree, provided the provision referred to the cheapest class of eating house as well as to the dearest class of restaurant, although naturally it would be more convenient for those who went to the better class of place, than for those who used not even a restaurant, but a public-house. Subject to that remark he had nothing to say about the first sub-section, except to agree with the hon. Member for Basingstoke that he did not think the Court would find it quite so easy to decide what a man's mission was in a licensed house as the Prime Minister imagined. The hon. Member for Basingstoke had referred to the American sandwich, and he did not know whether the unfortunate person died who ate it; but there were in America numerous ways of evading the law as to intoxicants being sold only with a meal. The *bona fide* "meal" usually ordered in Boston was a hard-boiled egg. The licence-holder found it very profitable, because nobody ever ate it. It was generally charged for at 5 cents., or 2½d. and in one morning a barman had been known to sell this same egg at 5 cents, a time to no fewer than fifty-seven customers. The clause as it stood was certainly open to abuse, and he thought it desirable that some sort of definition of what constituted a meal should be introduced, before this clause received its final shape. With regard to subsection (2) he rather thought it was a case of getting out of the frying pan into the fire. Under the words a publican was entitled to open during prohibited hours for the purpose of supplying refreshments other than intoxicating liquors. He had known cases in which publicans had been fined for doing that, and he was sure that the Licensing Commission never thought that from their recommendations such a thing could be possibly drawn. If the licensees did such things now, he thought the licensing justices would have something to say to them at the sessions. He was not going to ask the Government to withdraw this subsection. It was their business and not his, but it was open to the gravest possible abuse. It made police supervision extremely difficult, and would give encouragement to shebeening of all sorts, just the thing the Government were seeking to prevent. There were many ways of evading laws of this kind. He had heard of one station in America where, when the refreshment car of a train drew up at it, passengers might not have intoxicating liquors served to them, and when they ordered liquor it was served to them in a brown tea-pot. He considered this subsection would lead to that sort of thing, and he thought the Government were extremely ill-advised in regard to their new clause. Subject to these few remarks he had nothing to say, except that he did not object to the shortening of the hours on Sunday.

*MR. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington) said that he had felt in some difficulty to know whether he should support the clause or vote against it, and he would state his reasons. He had not the advantage of hearing the Solicitor-General's speech, as he was not in the House, but at the same time it appeared if they passed this subsection, it would go very much against the general spirit of what they had already done. They had been trying to help the landlord and his servants and to curtail the hours, and this to a very large extent was going to tie the landlord and the barmaid and the other servants, to keep in the houses all day long on Sunday. He might be wrong, but if he could be enlightened on this point he would be very glad, as he did not want to vote against the Government. On the other hand, if they did not pass it he was in another difficulty. Like the right hon. Gentleman who spoke from the front Opposition bench just before, he was very glad that they had done all they could to help Sunday closing. Like the right hon. Gentleman he was a Sabbatarian and a temperance man, but he hoped he was liberal-minded enough to remember that there were a large number of persons who were not Sabbatarians and temperance people like himself and others in the House, who supported these facilities on Sunday. Of course, they deplored it, but they did not want to force their Sabbatarianism or their temperance on those who differed from them. The hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs had referred to the temperance men generally as saying that drink was a wicked thing. They did not say that, but he would refer him to a very high authority, one of the wisest of men—he did not know if he was an abstainer—who, having had a life long experience, said—

> "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise."

He commended that to the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs; it was not the statement of a teetotaller. He did not want to be hard upon people travelling, or who were not Sabbatarians, or on those who went to a restaurant on Sunday, but he deplored the increasing tendency of this pleasure-loving age to break the Sabbath, not so much because it was breaking the Sabbath, as because of its tendency to deprive some people of enjoying the rest to which they were entitled. He deplored the fact on that ground, but still if people wanted to do those things on Sunday, and to take refreshment, he did not, as a temperance man, feel called upon to say that they should be cut down to the three or four hours they had agreed upon in the case of alcoholic liquor. He would be glad to be enlightened on these points.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that this clause had been very severely attacked from various quarters of the House, and he would like to make a few observations upon it. The second subsection was said to be declaratory of the law, viz., that at any time of the day or night a licensed house could be opened for the sale of non-intoxicating drink, and the hon. Member for Appleby had made a strong appeal to the Government to leave that out. He did not think that the hon. Member was as reasonable in that as in some of his requests. The Government had brought in a Licensing Bill including drastic measures in the way of Sunday closing, and it was essential to know on what basis they were starting. Did they think under this Bill that the public-houses would be able to keep open day and night for non-alcoholic refreshment? That was the basis of the Bill, and the Government had frankly let them into the secret, that they undertook this new Sunday closing because they considered that a man was now able to keep open all night for the purpose of supplying non-alcoholic refreshment, and that a man who wanted to get it at five o'clock on Sunday should be able to get it in a public-house. That was their intention, and they had been perfectly straightforward in stating to the House what their view of the law was and what it would be even if they left this clause out. What was the position? It was left in vagueness, and it came to this, that they were to "toss up" at the Law Courts after the views which they had heard expressed in the House. He did not put his views against those of the Solicitor-General, but he did think that it came to a "toss up" in the Law Courts as to what the proper course was. The Government had acted perfectly bravely in putting before the House what their view of the law was with regard to the sale of non-alcoholic refreshment in licensed houses during prohibited hours, and what they intended to do. It would be wrong, however, to leave out the subsection, as had been suggested, but if they had not changed their view of the law to what the Government considered it to be, they ought to seek to amend the subsection by saying that public-houses should not be open during closing hours for the sale of non-alcoholic liquors. The hon. Member had no right to ask the Government to leave out this subclause. The Government had come out into the open and had bravely said that that was what the law was, and what they intended it to be, and for that reason it was most important to hold to this clause. He thought they were wrong in their view, and that the clause would be a dangerous change in the law. The great objection to this provision was the difficulty of police supervision. If a licensed house were entitled to be open for the sale of non-alcoholic liquors at any time, it would be very difficult indeed to detect whether intoxicants were being sold or not. He himself might be returning from a meeting at one o'clock in the morning, and, feeling thirsty, want a drink. With a travelling flask in his pocket he might go into a licensed house and buy a bottle of soda-water. He would put in some whisky from his flask, and drink the two together. A policeman inspecting that house might think they had sold the whisky. Again, it would create the anomaly that a licensed house might sell a cup of coffee at any hour, but an unlicensed refreshment-house could not. As to the first subsection, it was certainly necessary to have some such provision. It was necessary that the public should know what the law was on this particular point, and therefore it would not be proper to leave the subsection out altogether. The proper thing to do would be either to agree with it or, if they disagreed, to deal with it by way of Amendment. The first subsection, therefore, was perfectly necessary. After considering this Bill for eight months, the Government five minutes before the closure fell on the Sunday closing clause, included the whole of London, and by that sudden decision hit every restaurant in London; for what use would it be to those restaurants to open only from 12.30 to 1.30 and from 6 to 8 in the evening? It was pointed out that the injustice applied to many country and seaside places also, where people frequently, in order to save the labours of the servants in their lodgings, went to dine in hotels. Therefore, as the clause was passed, it was distinctly unjust, and the Government in producing this new sub-clause did, perhaps, the best that it was in their power to do in the short time at their disposal. Nevertheless, he doubted whether the attempt which the Government had made was one of which to be proud. The matter required very careful consideration, and he could not help thinking that it had had very little. In particular, he questioned whether the phrases "a meal" and "a room set apart for the purpose" would stand critical legal examination. What a wonderful sub-clause it was! A person was entitled during the "closing" hours to be served with a meal in a room set apart for the purpose. When the Bill had been in operation for some years the publican would have to remember what the law was in 1908 before the Bill was passed, because it was only in those hours that a meal could be served in a room set apart for the purpose. What was a meal? That was a question he would deal with when that point was reached. Under the Bill the publican was entitled to supply a meal with intoxicating liquor in a room set apart. He had always advocated in his humble way alcohol with meals and not between meals, but he was not sanguine of people being converted by Act of Parliament. When it came to be put into an Act of Parliament it was a different thing. What was a room set apart for the purpose? In the cafés in the Strand and other places the bar was in the dining-room. Was that a room mainly set apart for the purpose of supplying food? Was the bar in cases like that to be closed? This obviously has not been thoroughly thought out, because first there was the critical difficulty of the meal, and secondly that of the room set apart The clause required much careful consideration for amendment and he wished that there was another Report stage to the Bill in order that the Government might reconsider the clause. If there were a second Report stage he would vote for subsection (1), because that idea was right, though the method of carrying out the idea was extremely faulty. The whole thing required very careful consideration and discussion by the public. The clause should be sent round to the people affected, the hotel and restaurant proprietors and so forth, so that they might make comments and suggestions upon it. It was absoutely necessary that the Government should make a declaration of what the existing law was, and though he differed from them he thought it necessary that they should make a declaration.

*Mr. SHERWELL (Huddersfield) said he had listened closely to the greater part of the debate, and he confessed that one question had been uppermost in his mind as he listened to the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Were they to understand that it was the considered and deliberate judgment of members of the Opposition that the provisions of the Bill without the new clauses under discussion were sufficient to meet the entire case of the Metropolis? The tendency of the debate so far, with the exception of the speech of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, was that the restricted hours and restricted facilities under the Bill were sufficient to meet all the legitimate needs and requirements of London.

Mr. RAWLINSON said he pointed out clearly that is was necessary to have some such section.

*Mr. SHERWELL said he had expressly excepted the hon. and learned Gentleman. He confessed that personally he could only congratulate the Government on introducing the clause, and he would divide the House if a proposal was made to withdraw it. The clause had his support, because it cleared up a certain ambiguity in the law as it now stood. He was not a lawyer, but during the last ten years he had studied these questions almost as closely as any lawyer, and it had always been his impression that the intention of the Government, as expressed in the clause, was the liberty allowed under the law as it stood, and he was confirmed in that impression by the testimony of some of the most expert legal advisers to licensing benches in the country. He believed that what had prevented the full exercise of the facilities in the past was the fear of jeopardising the licence. That fear of jeopardising the tenure of a licence was on the whole perfectly wholesome, and had proved to be a very powerful instrument in the direction of progress and reform as utilised by certain licensing benches. He would not for one moment weaken the power exercised by that fear, but it ought to have clearly-defined limits. He never had approved of any policy or system of administration which harassed the unfortunate publican at every turn.. So long as the licensed trade was recognised as legitimate or legal, so long did the licence-holder possess the right to a certain wholesome and justifiable liberty of action. The tendency of the opposite view always had been to degrade the trade and drive it into the least desirable hands. The fact that there was by common admission an uncertainty concerning the present law was in his judgment the best possible argument for the Government's clause. Objections had been urged against it, and certain fears had been expressed as to possible contingencies resulting from the adoption of the clause. He believed many of these objections had lost sight of the fact that the power given under the clause was a purely permissive power. No constraint was placed on the licensed victualler if he did not wish to open his premises for a particular purpose. With regard to the illustration of a flask of whisky being carried on to the premises, it seemed to him that in the judgment of any Court such a thing would be a most flagrant and deliberate attempt to evade the spirit and the letter of the law. He did not for a moment believe that hon. Members opposite in their moments of considered judgment would really think there was any substance in a fear of that kind. With reference to the non-definition of a meal, that would seem to cause a little misgiving in the light of experience, but he would remind hon. Members that that misgiving only had force against a condition of things that was not established in this particular proposal. The evasion of the law in New York which had been referred to was simply the result of an attempt to deny all facilities for the purchase of liquor. That was not the condition of things established under this Bill. If they carried out an extreme prohibitionist policy, far in advance of average sentiment, they would always be liable to such evasions of the law, but where they allowed, as they did allow under this Bill, adequate facilities for the obtaining of legitimate refreshment, he did not think they need indulge in fears of that kind. He would like to define his own position with regard to these proposals. It was that everything which would give a wholesome liberty of action to the licensed victualler was to be regarded by that House and by all administrative authorities as a thing to be encouraged. He knew that on that side of the House differences of opinion would arise as to what constituted a wholesome liberty of action. If one held the view that the public-house was wholly an evil institution, then obviously his hon. friends below him were justified in giving a proposal of this kind unstinted opposition; but where one held that a public-house under proper conduct was a useful and legitimate social institution, then they were bound to allow the man whom they put in charge of that trade that liberty of action to which, in his judgment, he was entitled. The weakness inherent in so much legislation of this kind in the past had been due entirely to this, that it represented the effort of those who did not frequent the public-houses to restrict the liberty and habits of those who were accustomed to frequent them. So long as they made that the basic principle of licensing legislation, so long would they be disappointed in attaining the goal which they all desired. After all, the proposals in this clause were simply a reversion to the original, true, and historical intention of Parliament in licensing the public-house. They all deplored the fact of the degradation of the public-house from a place of convenience and social resort for the legitimate purposes of refreshment to the open, flaunting bar which prevailed at the present moment. Hon. Members would recollect that the Lords' Committee on Intemperance in 1879 laid special stress on that point and urged the encouragement of all arrangements that would restore the public-house to its original character and purpose. Moreover, he was personally confident that some such clause as this was urgently required if their licensing arrangements were not to break down in London and in other large cities. The position of things that would certainly arise if this clause were not carried would become so intolerable as to threaten the security and the proper administration of the whole of our licensing system. He deplored the increasing tendency to advance too far beyond the level reached by the average civic opinion of our great cities. There was nothing that more imperilled the future achievement of substantial reform than the attempt precipitately to hasten the day. After all, the great strength of the temperance movement was not that which was represented by the enthusiasm of the ideals, noble as they were, of the advanced wing of the temperance party. There was a common desire amongst all sections of the community to get rid of the intolerable evils so often associated with the practical conduct of the liquor traffic. He was desirous that they should not do anything that would make for the alienation or for the ultimate estrangement of that great body of middle opinion in the country, and it was because he believed that the whole effect of this clause in its dual form would be healthy and wholesome, and that it would carry with it the great body of sincere conviction and sentiment in the country at large, that he most earnestly appealed to the Government not to give way on the point.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath) said he had listened with great interest to the speech just delivered. He would call attention to the clause as they found it before them, and if his hon. friend thought the reform of the public-house hinged upon subsection (2) of the clause he must unhesitatingly differ from him. He associated himself with his hon. friend in his general views on temperance reform, but as regarded this particular contribution, he had come to the conclusion that it would lead rather far from the path of real reform if it were adopted. The proposition was that for the first time in the licensing history of this country the licensees should be definitely told that they had full permission, if not the invitation of the Government, to conduct business on their premises after closing hours. That was a most curious position to take up, because, after all, they all knew it was a most difficult trade to administer. Let them take what happened in a great seaport town. Large clusters of public-houses were closed at closing time, and the licensees were very glad to get rid of the customers. If this clause passed, what would happen? These public-houses would be forced by competition to keep their houses open for hours after that. He was speaking of what he knew. The licensees themselves were most anxious that their business should be carried on during the hours already limited by Statute, but not that it should be carried on to all hours of the morning. They would have to open a fresh department of their business. They would have to provide for the refreshment of the night men and the drift and human wreckage of the streets, and he asked the most earnest consideration of the House to this practical position with which they were face to face. He was not concerned to go into the niceties of legal decisions one way or another. He knew that the practice, hitherto understood to be the law, was that the licensees had to finish business at closing time. Now they were invited by the Government to carry on and have their premises open after hours at which they had hitherto had to close. There were two classes in the country who would regard with the very gravest concern the passing of this subsection—the police, who would have to administer the law, and the majority of the licensed victuallers themselves. They desired to be protected against the difficulties of competition and the other things with which they had to contend. They were anxious to close their premises at their present hours. For his own part, he should be most regretfully compelled to vote against the Government if they insisted on carrying the subsection to a division, but he earnestly appealed to them, after the speeches which had been made on both sides, that they should see that the general sense of the House was against any alteration of the practice, whatever might be the technical law on the point, with regard to the closing of licensed premises.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that, when this clause was foreshadowed by the Solicitor-General a fortnight ago, he understood it to be received with general approval from the Opposition benches, but now most of the hon. Members opposite had succeeded in dissembling their love. As soon as a clause was put on the Paper by the Government, then it was to be shot at. Then there were nervous individuals who were always afraid of some great injury happening to the world if the world were only allowed a little liberty. They were so wise, and everybody else was so silly that the world was sure to go wrong unless put into a straight waistcoat. He hailed this clause as a great temperance measure; he thought it was one of the best parts of the Bill. This was a clause which said that a person might get a meal in a public-house during the same hours as he could have got it in before the passing of the Bill, and he thought that that was a temperance measure. They could have a square meal or a round meal and a glass of beer with it without anybody being prosecuted for it. This was a great temperance measure, giving people the opportunity to live like reasonable beings. It encouraged self respect, led to a greater consumption of non-alcoholic liquors, and was not so restrictive in its provisions as to provoke a desire to evade the law. Here was a chance to get the five o'clock tea. It had been objected that this provision would cause Sunday labour but that was just what would not happen. If people got tea at a restaurant their own servants would have a Sunday out. Every one knew that where they had unduly restrictive legislation it led to an increase of shebeens; but in this provision they did not draw the law too tightly, so that people would not be forced outside of the law. Let them get everyone inside the law, and then they would all live happily together.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said the hon. Member who had just sat down apparently did not realise that this particular clause would open the door to more evasion than any other clause of the Bill. If they were going to take credit for this clause as a great temperance measure, that was exactly what it would not be. They had heard a great deal of the United States and what went on there, and how easily the law was evaded. He had not the slightest doubt that if this clause were passed they would see an immense deal of evasion throughout the country, and drunkenness would largely increase. He could not help wondering just now, when he was getting a glass of milk and a bun at the refreshment bar, whether that would be considered a meal, for this Friday, as on last Friday, owing to the business pending in the House, that was all the meal he was able to get. The question had occurred to him whether under this provision he would have been allowed to have intoxicating liquor with his bun, if he had ordered it in a public-house. He had not the slightest idea whether it would have been permissible or not, and he would like to have that point elucidated. Supposing they came to the definition of a meal, he would like further to know at what point a meal became a meal, or at what point that which was partaken of as a meal ceased to be a meal, like his bun, for example, which was the only meal he had time to take in the circumstances in which he was placed. It was a point which ought to be dealt with and made clear in the clause. He failed to see how the subsections as they stood could possibly be worked unless they were altered. In opposing this clause they did not mean to say that there should be none at all, but the subsections as they stood were unworkable. The object of the Government, he took it, was to protect restaurants in London, and that object, so far laudable, was rendered necessary by the other provisions of this objectionable Bill. They ought to have had a proper consideration of this important provision, but he regretted to say that that was not possible under the conditions imposed on their discussion. They ought to have some better opportunity than this curtailed Report stage; as it was, they were obliged to take or leave this clause as it stood. That was the only alternative before the House. The guillotine fell at five o'clock, and as the provision was so entirely unworkable he should vote against it rather than accept it in its present form.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne) thought that the Government would be very well advised if they withdrew the second part of the clause. It was his privilege for a good many years to serve on the Manchester Watch Committee, and from the knowledge and experience which he had gained there he was of opinion that the admistration of the law under this clause would be an absolute failure. In one part of the city of Manchester there were a number of refreshment houses which had no licences. Under the present law these houses were compelled to close at a certain time. The Manchester Committee recognised that these houses were a great convenience to the people, and, therefore, did not put the law into operation but allowed them to remain open considerably later than the public-houses. But they became the resort of the most undesirable people in the town, and eventually the Watch Committee had to take action and compel those refreshment houses to close at the same time as the public-houses. But what did this clause say? He supposed it would be quite possible under it for two individuals to go into a restaurant at a quarter to eleven and order a magnum of champagne. As soon as the clock struck eleven were they to put what remained away? They might not have the same capacity as some hon. Members of that House. Had they at eleven o'clock to destroy the wine unconsumed? Or would it be possible, if they continued to drink at five minutes after eleven, for a policeman to go in and say that they were not allowed to supply drink after eleven o'clock, and yet there were people there drinking wine after that hour? Where a grocer had a licence, even in the Christmas season he was obliged to shut up his shop at eleven o'clock, while his competitors who had no licence continued to keep open. These alterations of the law opened up a very wide question, he did not know whether the Government realised how wide. It was an alteration that it would be impossible for the police to administer, and instead of its being a temperance reform it would have entirely the reverse effect.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.) said it was desirable to consider what would be the effect of this clause upon the hours of barmen and barmaids and other employees in public-houses. Last week the case of the barmen and others was put before him with a view to his doing everything possible to assist them in relation to the hours they had to work. The barman who put the facts before him had given him certain figures as to the hours they at present worked, and he asked the Government to consider what would be the effect of this provision extending the facilities for obtaining refreshments. It appeared to the employees that it must have the result of increasing their hours of labour. At the present time the barman worked from six in the morning until eleven at night, five days a week. On Wednesdays he left at one o'clock, having half a day off; he had one hour for dinner, half an hour for breakfast, and half an hour for tea. On Sundays he was at work from six until ten in the morning, "squaring things up." Then he was on duty again from 12.30 to 2.30, and again in the evening from six until 10.30. He had only to place these facts before the House to justify his asking, in the interests of these employees in public-houses, whether the Government could not see their way to withdrawing this provision. Though he was not speaking in the name of the Labour Party, he thought in what he said he had largely their sympathy.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said it did not matter in the least whether the subsection was approved or disapproved, because as a matter of fact it did not alter the law. It was a declaratory section, and both the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General stated that it set forth what the law was. If the subsection remained everyone would then know what the law was, but if it were withdrawn it would leave things in a chaotic state compared with what they were before.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said the opinion of the Prime Minister came as a great surprise when a fortnight ago he told them what he thought was the law in this matter. Everybody up till then had thought that when a licensed house was closed it was closed for all purposes. The section of the Act of 1874 said—

"All premises in which intoxicating liquors are sold by retail, etc., shall be closed."

He entirely agreed with his hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge University in his view of the law against that of the Prime Minister and Solicitor-General. At all events it had been taken to be the law by the trade generally, and for this reason, that it was a great risk for the publican to keep his house open. If he kept his doors open any person could go into the house, and it would be very difficult to refuse to serve him if he asked to be served. A case had been heard at Keighley the other day before an hon. Member of the House. He was not sure whether it was the hon. Member for Skipton who was on the bench; at all events it was someone of the same name. In that case it appeared that a teetotaler was prosecuted for being in a public-house and getting teetotal refreshments during prohibited hours, and he was convicted. That showed what the opinion of the magistrates was as to the law, and it was the view generally taken. He agreed with the view that the present law as administered was acting extremely well, and he joined with the hon. Member below the gangway in urging the Government to consider the hours which the employees in public-houses had already to work. It would be very hard upon them if they became liable to be called upon at any time in the twenty-four hours to serve people with refreshments. He thought the present hours for public-houses were satisfactory both for Sundays and week-days. They were perfectly content to rest on the present law with regard to closing hours. He would like to ask one question on the construction of the clause.

"Nothing in the Licensing Acts with respect to closing hours shall prevent,"

etc. Was it the intention of the Government to over-ride all the licensing law at present existing, and, if it was, what were they going to do in the case of new licences where the condition had been laid down that there should be no Sunday opening? Were six-day licensees to be allowed to open on the seventh day? The Solicitor-General shook his head, but the words of the clause were liable to misconstruction and he would advise that some words be put in to make that point clear. He thought it most desirable, too, to have some definition of a meal. The case was sure to be raised in the Courts in the absence of such a definition. The provision would be liable to great evasion, for a publican could set apart a tiny room, put a few biscuits and cheese on the table, and a man could come in and say he was having a meal and require liquor to be supplied to him. Although he thought some provisions of the kind were necessary, yet these provisions were badly drawn and ill-considered.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said the concessions the Government had made the other day in further restricting the hours for the sale of intoxicants in London had been received by the Press with great satisfaction, and he thought the Government had done right in bringing in this subsection (1) to carry out the statement of the Prime Minister that due regard should be had to those who required food in a restaurant, especially in London. But with regard to subsection (2) he appealed to the Government to withdraw it because through that declaration they were going against that public opinion which desired to restrict Sunday trading, and it would be difficult to carry out strict supervision by the police of public-houses in country places where, far removed from the oversight of those officially concerned, people might gather; and in many cases the risk was too great that drink might be supplied when it ought not. He hoped the Government would withdraw the clause and so avoid the opening of public-houses throughout the country during hours on which they had hitherto always been understood to be closed.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that the difficulty in which the House found itself would not be solved by the withdrawal of the clause. The real trouble arose some days ago when the Prime Minister declared the law to be as it was laid down in the clause. He was not going to dispute any question of law with the right hon. and learned Gentleman, but putting aside all question of what the law was, he was sure that the practice had been that all licensed houses had been closed and required to be closed during closing hours. They had been told officially that the law was the other way the other day, and since a grave doubt had arisen in many minds it must be solved by a clause stating the law one way or the other. Personally, he would rather state it in a contrary sense to what was laid down in subsection (2). To allow a public-house when it was closed for the purpose of selling drinks to remain open all night if need be for the purpose of selling food invited evasion of the law and created hardships not only to the persons employed but to the police who had to watch the conduct of the house. From every point of view he should support the law if laid down the other way, and therefore he could not vote for this clause. But it was no use merely to withdraw the clause. Whatever the law was it ought to be declared by the Government.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) would certainly support the Government if they went to a division, because he believed that their intentions were more than usually good. At the same time, he did not quite see how either of the clauses was to be enforced. During the summer he spent a few days at Gothenberg with some Swedish friends, and one evening, about ten or eleven o'clock, they went to an open-air café, and ordered drinks. The waiter produced a tiny plate of tiny sandwiches for each person. He asked what they were for, and his friends said, "That is the law. We cannot have a drink at this time of night without having a meal also, and this is the meal." Of course they gave it to the birds. They had to pay for it, but it only cost 3d. for the whole party. That was a very simple evasion which could be put into operation here as regarded the first part of the clause. With regard to the second part, there would also be evasion. Reference had been made to a man who went into a public-house after closing time with his own bottle of whisky and asked for a sandwich and soda-water. He would not be breaking the law according to this clause. But supposing one of his hon. friends, the hon. Member for Lincoln, for instance, found his flask empty late at night and went into a public-house and ordered his sandwiches, and while they were being brought his flask was surreptitiously filled by the publican. If a policeman entered and challenged him, out of goodness of heart, wishing to relieve the publican from the chance of having his licence suspended, he would naturally say that it was his whisky which he had brought into the house.

There was such a tremendous possibility of evasion under both these subsections that though the intention was excellent it was absolutely imperative to have some Amendment to make the clause workable.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) said that as he was going home the other night about a quarter to one from the House—he thought it was still sitting—he saw in front of him a policeman at a public-house corner, who tried each of the doors of the public-house, and having satisfied himself that they were securely closed went on. If this clause had been passed, and he had found the doors open, he supposed he would have had to go inside to make inquiry and look round all the rooms to see whether there was anybody taking any refreshment and whether he was drinking. According to the old French proverb, a door must be either open or shut. It was equally true that a public-house must be either open or shut. They were recommended not long ago to ask a policeman what was the law. If they asked any policeman, he would say it would be impossible for him ever to search or go his rounds in a reasonable time, if he had to do more than ascertain that the public-houses were closed. They were going to turn public-houses into three classes—coffee taverns, refreshment bars and refreshment rooms, and ordinary licensed victuallers houses, and they had different powers and different rights for the people who were there. People having lunch in a public-house on Sundays would be told at a certain time that they might finish their food, but must not drink any more. It was too preposterous for reasonable men to suggest that such a thing would be carried out. A person having a meal would be able to have liquor, but if he had a friend waiting for him who was not having a meal he would have to have temperance drink or go without. Was it reasonable that public-houses should be converted into these three kinds of refreshment premises? Would the Minister in charge explain what was the real position of the Government in regard to these premises, and whether during the closing hours they were still open for the purpose of obtaining food and refreshment? There was doubt about it, and the House should be advised authoritatively what was the opinion of the Government.

SIR S. EVANS said that the question upon which they were about to divide was whether or not this clause was to be read a second time. Upon that matter the Government certainly would vote for the Second Reading and ask the House to follow it. For debating purposes the clause was divisible into two, but not for the purposes of the division lobby. With regard to the second subsection, speaking personally, he did not mind much what happened to it. He had not changed his mind. He had never cared for it. It was not his. He was invited to declare what the law was, and he declared that the law was in the sense stated by the Prime Minister. When the matter was discussed he was reported to have said in *Hansard*, and very likely he did—

> "Whatever the meaning was under the Acts of 1872 and 1874 they had not changed it at all. In his opinion there was nothing in the licensing laws which prevented houses from opening for other purposes than the supply of intoxicating liquor and there had been no change in the law and it had been in operation since 1872. Personally he had no objection to putting in a declaratory section although he thought it would be better not to change the law but only to make it clear."

That was the situation so far as they were concerned ever since that time. They did not propose to and would not change the law. It appeared that there was a difference of opinion as to whether the law was properly declared in this section. But what would happen, supposing the subsection did not become part of this clause by reason of something done at a later stage, would be that the Courts of law would have to decide what the law had been since the year 1874. There was this advantage that whoever was called upon to argue the case would be absolutely precluded in the Courts of law from referring either to the opinion of the Prime Minister or to that of himself. But whatever was to happen to the second sub-clause, he thought perhaps after the very interesting debate, to every word of which he had listened, they might now take the division on the Second Reading.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) thought the whole House would feel that they were left in a most extraordinary position after the speech of the Solicitor-General, following upon the debate which had lasted nearly four hours. One of the five days occupied by the Report stage had been spent in discussing a new clause which the Government asserted was only declaratory, which most of their followers thought practically altered the law if it did not legally alter it, and on which there had been more hostile criticism directed from every part of the House than even this controversial and most unfortunate Bill had aroused at any other stage. The hon. and learned Gentleman gave a review of the attitude of the Government on the second subsection of the clause. He said that the Prime Minister a few days ago gave his view of what the law actually was with regard to supplying non-alcoholic refreshment in public-houses. He went on to say he confirmed the view of the law taken by the Prime Minister. That was what a Law Officer always ought to do, and he congratulated the hon. and learned Gentleman on having thoroughly justified his position in the Government.

SIR S. EVANS: That is not my view of the duties of a Law Officer.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not quarrel as to the theory and the practice of the hon. and learned Gentleman. Let the House observe what the result of this had been. The learned Gentleman now said he was perfectly indifferent to the fate of subsection (2), and if it was rejected he indicated to the House his opinion that after all matters would be as they were. Matters would not be as they were, and they never again could be as they were. Things had got far beyond that. It was perfectly true that, if this subj ect ever came before the Courts of law, neither the Prime Minister's opinion nor that of the Solicitor-General nor that of any Member of that House could be urged before the tribunal. But was it not equally true that the magistrates who had to deal with the renewal of licences, and the police who had to deal with the actual supervision of public-houses, could never again after the debate that had taken place in the House, and after the Amendment put down by the Government, look at the problem before them with the same eyes with which they had looked upon it before? An hon. Gentleman had pointed out that what really would prevent the abuse of the liberty given by the second subsection was the fear of the interpretation that would be put upon his conduct by the licensing justices. There was one point on which he wholly agreed with the hon. Member for Huddersfield. He had said it was not fair to harass the publicans by leaving in doubt what they might do and what they might not do. They ought to make them work under perfectly plain and unmistakable directions. They ought to decide what exactly was lawful and what was unlawful for them to do. Hitherto the existing system had worked, because magistrates, policemen, licence-holders, and the public generally were all of one mind as to what the law was. The actual people who administered the laws, who ran and used public-houses, were all of one mind that a public-house could not be open after it became illegal to sell intoxicating liquors. As that was the universal practical system at work, there was no legal ambiguity which the licence-holder suffered. What was going to be his position after this debate? Every public-house throughout the country would have to reconsider its position as to what it was to do after the hours when it was no longer legal to sell intoxicating drinks. Some would come to one decision, some to another, as to their proper course. Those who thought that the circumstances of competition or the hope of profit made it desirable to keep their place open would always have before them the fear that the old practice of policemen and magistrates would still obtain, and they would be harassed and persecuted by those whose business it was to administer the law. If, on the other hand, the magistrates and police, after reading this debate, were convinced by the admirable legal arguments of the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General, they would say it was quite clear that the public-house might open, and they would have to give directions to the police everywhere to go into the houses after the hours of closing and to see that those who were eating sandwiches were not taking liquor obtained from the public-house. They had had a great deal of biography and autobiography in the debate. The Member for York had told the history of an imaginary Sunday. He went into a restaurant at 12 o'clock, and discussed politics with the lady behind the bar; he had luncheon at 2 o'clock, and afterwards began to drink; then he had a meal at 6 o'clock, and so on until the small hours of the morning.

The hon. Member for Preston had given a biography of the Member for Lincoln—the cruellest cut of all. He presented a picture of the hon. Member going into a public-house with an empty flask, getting it surreptitiously filled by the publican, and then, in an access of mendacious generosity, denying to the policeman that he had done anything illegal. He did not propose to draw a picture, imaginary or otherwise, of his own career, but he would point out that he did not think it possible for them to get out of this difficulty merely by the Government withdrawing a subsection or allowing themselves to be beaten on a subsection; they must do something to make clear in the future the law which they had made practically ambiguous. Of course, they were discussing this difficult question in almost impossible conditions. As one hon. Gentleman naively remarked there was not a second Report stage. But it would be possible for the Government to withdraw this clause altogether and to recommit the Bill for the purpose of introducing a clause on this subject, in which they would deal with the difficulty for which they themselves were more or less personally responsible. They could not leave it where it was. The Government should recommit the Bill, not, of course, generally, but for the purpose of reintroducing another clause, dealing with the admitted deficiencies, making the law perfectly clear as regarded subsection (2), and making it rational and workable as regarded subsection (1). He earnestly pressed that upon the Government, but as far as the clause itself was concerned it was quite impossible that he should vote for it.

MR. ASQUITH said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman had been entirely devoted, not to that part of the clause which made a change in the law (which, of course, was the important part of it), but to that part which professed to declare the law as it already existed. He thought it would have been more logical if the right hon. Gentleman had suggested some reason why the House should vote against that part of the clause which really did alter the existing law. As regarded the declaratory subsection, he was afraid he was himself really the fountain of all the mischief, because in an imprudent moment he ventured to say what he thought was the existing law of the land upon this subject. It was not necessary for him to do so, and he very much regretted that he did. He should take a lesson from what had been said in the debate and speak with more reserve in the future. But the view of the law which he ventured as a mere *obiter dictum* to enunciate, was supported by the much greater authority of the Solicitor-General, and he did not think it had been seriously challenged by any one who had taken part in the debate. The hon. Member for Kingston, who was a great authority in those matters, thought a law ought to be enacted in the opposite sense, but he did not understand him to say that this declaration was a misconception or perversion of the law as it existed.

MR. CAVE: I did not think it right to discuss it with a law officer of the Crown.

MR. ASQUITH said his hon. and learned friend gave a charming example of the modesty which he always believed really characterised the legal profession. But if he attributed his modesty on this occasion not to an unusual or abnormal access of diffidence but rather to a feeling that he could not seriously contest the legal proposition laid down by his hon. and learned friend he did not think he would be going far wrong. But he would tell the House quite frankly he believed that this subsection declared the law as it was. If that was so, it was quite open to the argument that it was unnecessary, because the Courts would put that interpretation upon the law, and indeed had put it in the only case that had ever been tested. But in response to the appeal made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the Member for Kingston that they should actually recommit the Bill in order that they should declare that the law was not what it had always been understood to be and what the Courts of Law had interpreted it to be—that was a very unusual and a very unreasonable demand. But in coming to a decision on this clause he said quite plainly that, as far as the Government was concerned, the important feature in this clause was the change in the law and not the declaration which was embodied in the clause. He should be quite ready, if the House would assent to the Second Reading of the clause and therefore assent to that change, in deference to a general opinion —if there were a general opinion—to omit any reference to the law as it actually was, and to allow the Courts to go on in the future as they had done in the past interpreting the existing Acts He hoped the House would now be willing to come to a decision upon the Second Reading of this clause.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said that the Solicitor-General, in a previous debate, replying to a Question put by the hon. Member for the West Derby division of Liverpool, made one of the most unfortunate statements in the cause of temperance that had been made in the House for many years. What was the position of the Government? What the exact legal definition of the law might be he did not care, but in every district throughout the United Kingdom the practice had been that when intoxicating liquors could not be sold no refreshments could be sold in licensed houses at any hour during closing time. That had been the law as carried out in every town in the United Kingdom, and that had been the general interpretation placed upon the law. It was no use the Prime Minister saying he was willing to withdraw the clause in deference to the general wishes of the House. [Cries of "Divide."] It was no use hon. Members interrupting him, because he should not sit down until he had said what he intended to say. It was the duty of the Government to put in a clause making it illegal to sell refreshments at any time when the licensed premises were closed. If the Government were anxious to promote temperance on Sunday their duty was not to put in a declaratory statement of the dictum of the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General, but to insert a clause providing that the opening of licensed premises on Sunday when liquor was not allowed to be sold was illegal. This so-called declaratory clause was one which would alter the law in every district in England, and it was proposed by a Government which professed to have brought forward this Bill in the cause of temperance. If the law was as the Prime Minister said at present, why should this declaratory clause be passed? What would be the meaning of the clause as carried out in practice? Assuming that there were twenty or thirty licensed houses in a locality, and supposing that there were people in each of these houses drinking ginger ale, was a policeman to go round and taste every glass to make sure that it was not brandy or some similarly coloured alcoholic drink? How would it be possible to enforce the law when policemen could not be in all the public-houses at the same time? The so-called declaratory clause was an invitation to the trade to keep open their houses on Sunday at all times for the purpose, not of supplying legitimate refreshments, but of selling liquor. For his part, he refused to accept the statement of the law as laid down by the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General. He remembered when the last Licensing Bill was under discussion in the last Parliament Sir Robert Finlay, who was then Attorney-General, one of the University members, the late Sir John Lawson Walton, and the present Lord Chancellor, held diametrically opposite views on the construction and reading of the clause which had brought about the Kennedy judgment. They had then two learned lawyers on both sides of the House holding different views, and the meaning of the Act had to be declared by the Court. If this was a temperance measure it was absolutely necessary that the Prime Minister, after making this unfortunate statement, should so alter the law as to make it in accordance with what had been the universal practice. Hon. Members on both sides of the House had stated that this declaratory clause would inevitably work harm all over the country. If this was a Licensing Bill, why should not the Government have the courage of their convictions? Why did they not bring in a clause to make the law quite clear without being dependent on the dictum of any lawyer in the House? He considered the Bill one to facilitate Sunday drinking in public-houses and clubs. He would vote against this clause, and against the Third Reading of the Bill.

*COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes), said he would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General to the law in relation to refreshment houses which sold non-intoxicating liquors. These little shops had to be closed during the same hours as public-houses. These refreshment houses could not be kept open to sell lemonade when public-houses were closed. The police regulations provided that licensed refreshment house keepers opening or keeping open refreshment houses, or selling, or exposing for sale, in such houses, any refreshment, or any article whatever, during the time the premises licensed for the sale of non-intoxicating liquors were required to be closed, were liable to a penalty. He submitted that the dictum which had gone forth from the Prime Minister would be very dangerous to members of the trade, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to say across the floor of the House that he had committed an error of judgment, and then the thing would come to an end.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 199; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 377.)

AYES.

Alden, Percy
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies,M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter

Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King,Alfred John(Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, Sir George
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)

Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn.A C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberston,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson,Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon, John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne,G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander

Verney, F. W.
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G.(Winch'ster
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave George
Cecil Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cochrane, Hon. Thos, H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James(Down, E
Cross, Alexander
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Heaton, John Henniker
Hope, James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants, Fareham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesalll)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, A. H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H.(Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

*MR. LUTTRELL moved to omit subsection (1) of the new clause. His contention was that the object of the Bill, so far as Sunday closing was concerned, was to restrict the hours during which intoxicating liquors could be supplied on licensed premises. He believed that with the approval of almost the whole of the Members on the Ministerial side, and a large proportion of Members on the other side, it had been agreed to restrict the hours of opening from six to three in the country and from seven to four in London. If this clause was retained, it would render almost nugatory all that had been done. They would then have licensed premises open on Sunday, not for three hours only, but practically for six hours of the day. On temperance grounds, and out of consideration for the people employed in these licensed premises, he objected to the clause, believing that if passed it would do very great harm. He believed that the temperance party and the country generally had accepted with pleasure the proposal of the Government to limit the hours from six to three, and they greatly regretted the extension. Whatever the lawyers might say, all practical people would agree that it would have the effect of allowing drinking to take place upon licensed premises for not only three hours on Sunday, but for six hours. They knew how difficult it was to set apart one room for meals accompanied by drinking. This was a clause which ought to be opposed by all those who were in favour of seeing a temperance measure carried out in a practical manner.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he seconded the Amendment for the simple reason that the introduction of the provision as to the allocation of a special room for meals was open to the transparent evasion of the raw. The Government were proposing to take away with one hand what they had given with the other, particularly as legarded Sunday closing in London. He thought that four hours were amply sufficient to cover all the wants of the hotels and restaurants in London.

Amendment proposed to the clause—

"To leave out subsection (1)."—(*Mr. Luttrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'Sunday,' line 4, stand part of the clause"

Sir S. EVANS said he believed that his hon. friend who had moved the Amendment would admit that this matter had been fully discussed, and that it was not necessary for him to repeat what he had already said. The law, so far as the consumption of intoxicating liquor with meals was concerned, would hereafter remain exactly as it now was. The Government thought the clause was reasonable and was not open to the objections that had been taken to it. It was not, in their opinion, unfair nor unjust, nor against the true interests of temperance to allow intoxicating liquors to be supplied with meals in the way proposed.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said the Amendment put him in a position of considerable difficulty. He did not think that anyone who had read the subsection could imagine that it was a satisfactory subsection to stand in any Act of Parliament. The clause was an exceedingly good object lesson of the vice of the whole legislation of the Government on this subject. They saw an evil, and they brought in a Bill to remedy it, which was ridiculously out of proportion to the evil. An injustice was in this case pointed out to them; they attempted to remedy it and in so doing destroyed the whole effect of the legislation they proposed. He thought that hon. Members who looked into this matter would discover three great blots in the legislation proposed by the Government. In the first place they attempted greatly to restrict the hours of Sunday opening in London to meet an evil which, so far as it existed, was not in proportion to the drastic remedy they proposed. It was pointed out to them that it would be impossible to obtain meals in ordinary eating houses in London on Sundays under these conditions; and when they were faced with that, the Government proposed this clause to exempt eating houses from their Sunday closing regulations, but the clause was extremely ill designed for the purpose. The time when the houses might be open was not clearly defined. It was made to depend on the state of the law which existed before the passing of the Bill. There was no reason why the Government should not have stated the hours that were to be applied to eating houses in London as to the other parts of the country.

Sir S. EVANS said that that would have taken up thirty lines.

Lord R. CECIL said that thirty lines of print would not have ruined the country, and would have saved the hotel proprietors and publicans a great deal from a business point of view. The second blot was in the phrase "taking a meal." He thought that, after the speech of the hon. Member for Preston, nobody would find that that was a good test of deciding what was an ordinary eating-house as opposed to an ordinary public-house. At any rate that test as applied in Sweden was absolutely futile and ridiculous. How could it be said what amounted to a meal? What was a meal to a working man was very different from what was a meal to a millionaire. A piece of bread and cheese might be an excellent meal for a working man, but might not be a meal to some hon. Members. A man might give an order for a few sandwiches, and that might be regard as "taking a meal," in order to obtain as much intoxicating liquor as he wished. The third blot on the clause was, what was a room set apart for the purpose of taking a meal? These three blots would make the clause in effect absolutely unworkable. He approved of the object of the Government. which was not to enforce Sunday closing in ordinary eating houses and restaurants, but he was afraid he could not vote for the clause, while he did not see his way to vote against it. He very much regretted that the conditions under which the Bill had been discussed made it impossible for hon. Members to say whether they would vote "aye" or "no." That was a position in which they ought not to be put, but under the circumstances it seemed to be impossible for them to vote either way. The House had good reason to complain of the manner in which the Government had misconducted this Bill.

*Mr. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) said that the whole situation was puzzling. In Scotland, where they had total Sunday closing, there was no question of keeping open eating-houses at any hours. He understood that the clause was especially intended to protect the keepers of restaurants in London, but it applied to the whole country, and it seemed to him to be a very dangerous clause, because it would not restrict but extend the hours during which drinking might take place on Sundays. In his opinion what was wanted was a higher ideal of home life on Sunday. Sunday was a day for rest and worship, and he would certainly vote for the Amendment, as he did not wish to see the hours of Sunday opening extended.

*SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) said that before he voted for the Amendment he would like a clear understanding of what he was voting for or against. In the early stages of the Bill he had voted with the Government, because he understood that their proposal was to reduce the hours of opening public-houses on Sunday. He would like to know whether, if this new clause was passed, there would be three divisions of time for public-houses on Sunday—a time when liquor could be supplied; a time when liquor could be supplied with food; and a time when only food could be supplied, but when it would be open to any British subject to enter a public-house with whisky in his pocket, and obtain a bottle of soda water to add to the whisky and drink it there. The exposition of the law by the Prime Minister amounted to a deliberate invitation to the publican to keep his house open as long as he could reasonably do so for the convenience of the public. He understood that there might be a difference of opinion as to the application of the law under the first subsection, and therefore, if that was a correct deduction from the speeches made by lawyers in the House, as a member of a temperance society he could not support the clause, which tended towards violating the sanctity of the Sabbath, and would vote for the Amendment.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.) said that the House seemed to forget what the people of London had to say on the matter. The House of Commons was supposed to be a representative assembly, but they all knew that if the question was put to a popular vote there would be a majority of nine to one in favour of the extension of hours on Sunday. Therefore, he would vote for the clause.

Amendment negatived.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS moved to leave out the word "Sunday," and to insert the words "week-days." It would, he said, be admitted that under the subsection of the clause under discussion a house might be open on Saturday and the whole of Sunday for the sale of refreshments. If that were so, why should not the house be open on Sunday for the supply of liquor to persons who wished to take a meal during the whole of the time that a public-house might be open on week days? The House would remember that in the country the hours during which a public-house could be open now were, in the middle of the day, from 12.30 to 2.30, and in the evening from 8 to 10; and in London from 1 to 3 during the day, and in the evening from 6 to 11. But these hours were to be very restricted henceforth. What he contended was that these hours were not reasonable hours for a person who wanted to take a meal. A person ought to be able to take a meal at any hour of the day, and to have refreshments supplied to him with his meal if he wanted them. Therefore, he submitted that his Amendment was a very reasonable one, and should be accepted. Anyone coming to London on a Sunday ought to be able to get liquor at any hour he liked; but under this Bill he would have to recollect at what hour he would be able to get a drink. Why should he not be able to get a glass of beer at twelve o'clock instead of having to wait until half-past twelve before being served?

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment, because he believed that the restriction of Sunday opening should never have been extended to London, and the Amendment would go in some small measures to minimise the evil which would be caused by the clause as it stood. London was an entirely different place from any other town or city in the country, and that was the reason why there was such an enormous number of hotels which were used by people coming from foreign countries. It was perfectly well known that in every foreign country people might have their meals in restaurants or hotels at any time of the day, and he believed that a great blow would be inflicted on the prosperity of London if foreigners could not go to any restaurant or hotel—say to the Ritz, or to the Carlton, on which enormous sums of money had been spent—in the same way that they were accustomed to do in their own country, and get liquor, either with or without a meal.

And, it being Five of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 17th July, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the clause under consideration.

Question put, "That the clause be added to the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 378.)

AYES.

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Dev'np'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd)
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Jir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Ro'sendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R L (Caithness'sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Cap. Hn. A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E.
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.

Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackma'nan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Cap. Hn. G. (Winch'ster)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Glendinning, R. G.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robinson, S.
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, R. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Forster.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Questions on the new Clause and the Amendments moved by the Government of which Notice had been given which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 11th November.

New clause—

"(1) When a poll for a Parliamentary election takes place in any constituency, no person shall, during the hours of poll, sell or expose for sale any intoxicating liquor in any licensed premises except to persons lodging on the premises, and to persons taking meals on the premises in a room set apart for the purpose, and in the case of railway refreshment rooms at a station, to persons arriving at or departing from the station by rail, and subject to those exceptions, no person shall during those hours be on any licensed premises for the purposes of obtaining or consuming intoxicating liquor. (2) If any person acts in contravention of this provision he shall be liable in respect of each offence to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Question put, "That the clause be added to the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 379.)

AYES.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Black, Arthur, W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)

Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester
Lambert, George
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John

Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Forster and Mr. Pike Pease.

Amendments proposed :—

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out from the word 'scale,' to end of subsection."

"In page 2, line 6, at end to insert the words 'Provided that this provision shall not prevent a new licence being granted for any premises which are constructed, fitted, and intended to be used in good faith for any purpose to which the holding of an on-licence is merely auxiliary, in cases where the Licensing Commission give their consent, on being satisfied that under the special circumstances of the case the grant of the licence is reasonably required in order to meet the wants of the district or of persons resorting to the district, and that such conditions will be imposed as will prevent the misuse of the licence to be granted.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 20, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.' "—(*Sir S. Evans*).

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 199 ; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 380.)

AYES.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.

Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. HnA.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Norman, Sir Henry
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick. T. T. L.
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G.(Winchester
Barnard, E. B.
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants, Fareham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nolan, Joseph
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Mr. Pike Pease.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the word 'district,' and to insert the words 'parish or area.'"

"In page 2, line 35, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.'"

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out the word 'district' and to insert the words 'parish or area.'"

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out subsection (7).'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

And, it being Five of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty - eight minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 16th November, 1908.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Annual Report of proceedings under The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, etc., for the year 1907.

TRANSVAAL.

Correspondence relating to a proposal to recruit labour in Madagascar for employment in the Transvaal Mines.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 583. Southern Nigeria (Report for 1907).

No. 584. Report on the work of the Imperial Institute, 1906–1907.

No. 585. Barbados (Report for 1907–1908).

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1896.

Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland, for the year 1907.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of March, 1908.

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Rules made by the Board of Trade Nos. CXXVII.—CXLVI.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Order made by the borough council of Nelson, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Order granted by His Majesty to Mary Ann Spillane, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, 195, Mare Street, Hackney, E.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table.

TERRITORIAL ARMY—PERMANENT STAFF.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: My Lords, I rise to call attention to a recent decision of the Army Council in connection with the permanent staff of the Territorial force. This is a matter of a far-reaching character, and unless some alteration is made in the system I think it will have a very serious effect on the whole position of the Territorial force. I do not propose to go into the whole question of the permanent staff. I think it very probable that representations will be made to the War Office or to the Army Council on this point. But what we have to bear in mind is that the permanent staff generally has been very much reduced from what it was in the old days, and I think that in most cases County Associations have found that it has been reduced very much below what, in their opinion, it ought to be. One of the principal inducements held out originally by the Government in support of their scheme was the extra efficiency there would be in the new Territorial as compared with the old Volunteer; and what seems curious to the civilian mind is that in order to secure this extra efficiency they reduce the permanent staff, on which efficiency so largely depends, very much below what it was before.

One point in connection with the permanent staff is the retirement of the sergeant-instructors by seniority; and, though I do not propose to deal with that point to-night, I should like to draw attention to the fact that whereas in many cases the establishment laid down by the Regulations has not been supplied, and whereas in many cases the senior members of the permanent staff have done very valuable service in raising the force, they are, by the Regulations, to be reduced entirely by seniority. It seems to me a pity that these Regulations, which are admittedly only tentative and which have not yet had the test of experience, should be rigidly insisted upon so far as the civilian side is concerned, while every latitude is given in regard to the military side. I have in mind a case in one battalion in which a strong representation was made that the two senior sergeant-instructors should have an extension of time. This was approved by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, but, when submitted to the Army Council, the proposal was overruled and the two men received summary notice.

But the point to which I wish to call attention to-night is the position in which we are placed when it becomes necessary to get rid of an unsatisfactory member of the permanent staff. We had a case in point, and representation was made by the officer in command of the unit that a certain sergeant-instructor should be re-posted to his regiment. The officer in charge of the record, very naturally, made full inquiry into the matter, and, having satisfied himself, the application was endorsed and eventually forwarded to the Army Council, who over-ruled the opinions of all the intermediate military authorities and refused to sanction the re-posting of this sergeant-instructor to his regiment. The Army Council refused on three grounds. The first was that—

> "As regards the statement by the commanding officer that this non-commissioned officer occasionally takes too much drink, I am to state that if that man had been kept under strict supervision it is possible that disciplinary action might have been taken against him."

This ruling suggests a rather grave, and a totally undeserved, censure on the commanding officer in question; but while, no doubt, he made a mistake, I, for one, can thoroughly appreciate the desire to get the man re-posted to his regiment without the publicity and scandal which would follow from taking the course suggested. Moreover, he was supported, as I say, by the intermediate military authorities. With a reduced permanent staff, surely it is not unreasonable for those connected with the County Associations to ask that the permanent staff allotted to them should be men of such a character that they will not require strict supervision to see that they do not take too much to drink. I think that commanding officers have a right to ask that the permanent staff should help them in the supervision of the non-commissioned officers and men in their command. The second ground given for the refusal was—

> "As to the statement that he does not show a good example in the way of obedience to orders, I am to say that the Army Council rely on commanding officers to maintain a proper state of discipline in their units so as to ensure obedience to orders by all under their command."

Here is a source of insubordination introduced from outside, and one would have thought that in order to restore discipline the first step would be to get rid of the source of insubordination. The commanding officer, however, is prevented from doing so by the ruling of the Army Council. But the third, and, perhaps the most far-reaching, reason given was that—

> "The Army Council do not consider that a case which can be properly dealt with in the ordinary course of discipline can be satisfactorily met by re-posting to a Line battalion, particularly when, as in the present case, the non-commissioned officer would, on re-posting, become entitled to a higher rate of pay than when on the Permanent Staff."

That is a point on which, I think, the future of the Territorial force very largely depends; and I hope it will be made perfectly clear that in allotting men to the permanent staff the conditions of service shall be such that they shall not be worse off than when serving with their own regiments. I do not think it is an exorbitant demand, because it is certain that if this state of things continues there will be dissatisfaction among the permanent staff, and those who know what influence the permanent staff exercise will realise how much chance there is of making the force a success if this dissatisfaction exists.

I should like your Lordships to consider for one moment how the present system works. My noble friend the other night congratulated himself and us on the decentralisation scheme in connection with the Territorial force. But how does this decentralisation work in practice? A commanding officer of a unit applies for the re-posting of one of his permanent staff; after a long correspondence, this proposal is supported and approved by all the intermediate military authorities; yet when it eventually goes up to the Army Council the proposal is completely overruled. One would have thought that, even if the Army Council have no confidence in the commanding officers of the units of the Territorial force, they at any rate would have some confidence in the highly-paid military authorities who are placed in command of the various divisions; and it does seem to me an extraordinary thing that in a case like this, where the Army Council cannot have the same intimate knowledge of the facts, they should conceive it to be part of their duty to overrule the decision of everyone of the intermediate military authorities. We heard a good deal at one time about the blending of the civil and military elements in this scheme. We were told that it was a great scheme which employed for a common purpose the broad general knowledge of the civilian and the technical skill of the soldier, and that excellent results would follow. I do not know what the broad general knowledge of the civilian may be; but, if this is the principle that governs the military administration, the less we know of it the better we shall like it. I ask the noble Lord, with all earnestness, seriously to consider the whole position of the permanent staff. While we have nothing to say against military discipline—that, of course, must be maintained — the noble Lord may be certain that if this force is to be a success and to be held together, that result will be achieved more by civilian interest than by military discipline.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord LUCAS): My Lords, I will take the points with which the noble Earl dealt in the order in which he raised them. First of all, I will state what has been done with regard to the permanent staff. When the re-organisation took place the numbers of the permanent staff were considerably cut down; and when the new units of the Territorial force were recognised it was announced, and I think fully understood, that they were to have in many cases a smaller number of permanent staff than before. This was arrived at after a good deal of consideration. At first the number fixed was three per unit, the unit in that case being an infantry battalion. This number was in many cases rather too small, and the subject has been since reconsidered. We have had the recommendations of commanding officers forwarded through the military channels, and also the recommendations of general officers commanding-in-chief, and the matter is undergoing reconsideration with a view of meeting, as far as is necessary, the considered demands that have been made.

The result is that we now sanction up to eight permanent staff for a battalion of infantry. We quite recognise that at the present time the conditions are abnormal, that there is a much larger number of recruits at present, and more work for the permanent staff than is likely to occur again. In addition to a maximum of eight permanent staff per battalion of infantry, the general officer commanding may sanction, if he thinks necessary, the attachment of a number of temporary instructors to tide over the abnormal time and help to train the very large number of recruits. Of course, their work would be finished as soon as things again reached normal. When it was decided to reduce the number of the permanent staff the War Office had to consider how best this could be done. We had to look upon it, not only from the point of view of the battalion whose permanent staff was being reduced, but also from the point of view of the permanent staff themselves.

It was decided, after a great deal of consideration, to adopt exactly the same procedure as would have been followed had the men been serving at the time in the Regular Army—that is to say, the men would be retired by seniority. Any other plan would be unfair to the men. This avoided the possibility of perhaps undue favour being shown to one man rather than another, it enabled those who had not put in their full twenty-one years to serve on for the full pension, and it also enabled the Territorial Army to have the services of the youngest men possible, the men freshest from the Colours and most in touch with modern ideas in training and modern developments. For all these reasons it was decided that the retirements should be made by seniority. It was impossible to make an exception in regard to the particular case referred to by the noble

Earl, because, if we had, we should have been compelled to make an exception in practically every case. We admit that it was, perhaps, not altogether the most suitable way of dealing with the matter if we looked simply and solely at the point of view of the Territorial force; but we had also to act from the point of view of doing justice to the men of the Regular Army on the permanent staff.

I now come to the other case to which the noble Earl referred. We have called for all the papers, and as soon as they arrive the case will be most carefully considered. Therefore I can say nothing on that matter at the present moment. I agree that the Territorial force should always have a permanent staff which is above suspicion. With the best intentions in the world, however, you cannot be certain that a man will not develop unfortunate tendencies after he has left the Colours. Then comes the question, how are you to deal with such a man. If he has been allowed to get into bad habits, if he has not been checked—and, after all, there is very powerful machinery ready to hand for checking him—it would be rather hard, he having become a much less efficient non-commissioned officer than before, that the Regular Army should be asked to take back, so to speak, a damaged article. On his return, that man would have to carry out the important duties and responsibilities of colour-sergeant of his company, and if he had got into bad habits while away from the Colours the probability is that on his return he would have a bad effect upon his company. We are most anxious in a case of this sort, which is almost inevitably bound to happen sometimes, that the officer commanding the Territorial unit should take immediate steps, if the man commits a breach of the regulations which justifies it, to have him court-marshalled, or the case should be brought to the notice of the authorities before the mischief is allowed to get worse and to spread. We hope that in future commanding officers of Territorial units whose permanent staff misbehave will at once deal with the cases by the means they have at their disposal.

Lord Lucas.

The noble Earl then mentioned the question of pay. We have discussed the pay of the permanent staff in this House a good many times, and I do not propose to re-open the matter. The pay of the permanent staff of the Territorial Army is lower than the pay of men in the corresponding rank in the colours, and it is so for a certain definite reason. It is considered that the work which a man on the permanent staff of the Territorial Army has to do is less than if he were with his regiment. He is also saved a number of expenses such as, for instance, frequent moves, which, if he is a married man, are a serious matter to him. There are, of course, in the various allowances opportunities of making money in other ways; and, if you take it from that point of view, we consider that the men on the permanent staff are very fairly paid. In the case to which the noble Earl referred, the man on being re-posted to his battalion would, as a matter of fact, have received an increase of pay, and this was considered undesirable in the case of a man who was being re-posted for serious and grave misconduct.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: In view of what the noble Lord the Under-Secretary has said, I would point out that, under Paragraph 139 of the Regulations dealing with offences by members of the permanent staff, it is laid down that the powers of the commanding officer as regards any award involving an entry in the conduct sheet can be exercised only by and under the authority of the officer commanding the district. Guided by that, the commanding officer in the present case conceived that under this paragraph he could only report the man to the officer in charge of records, which he did, and this may be one reason why more stringent treatment was not meted out. While we fully recognise that it is impossible to ensure that members of the permanent staff should be always reliable, what we do think is that when they are proved unreliable we should have a chance of getting rid of them. That is the point in this case; and I think, when the facts have been gone into, it will be found that it was not while with the Territorial force that this officer acquired his bad habits. I should like to ask the noble Lord how soon the matter will be settled.

*LORD LUCAS: It is for the reasons which the noble Earl has given that the matter is being reconsidered. We hope to be able to announce our decision very shortly. We are only waiting now for the papers to arrive.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: Would it not be possible to allow the general officer commanding-in-chief to deal with his own permanent staff? It seems ridiculous to have to refer all these matters to the Army Council.

LORD SAYE AND SELE: My Lords I rise merely to say that my experience which is five years as an adjutant and five years as a commanding officer of Auxiliary forces, leads me to this conclusion, that unless it is made easy for a commanding officer to get rid of a member of his permanent staff who does not behave himself, his battalion is bound to deteriorate. If the permanent staff know that a letter must be written to the general officer, and that then a communication must go to the Army Council before they can be got rid of, they will not behave as they would if they knew that the commanding officer could give them very short shrift.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I rather gather, from the reply of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary that the placing of difficulties in the way of commanding officers getting rid of incompetent non-commissioned officers was not intended by the Army Council. What is wanted is an assurance from the Government that the Territorial force is to be given a fair chance, and that commanding officers will not be saddled with inefficient members of their staffs whom they cannot get rid of. I have had some experience in this matter, and know that it is difficult sometimes to get good permanent staff. Regular officers are very glad to get rid of incompetent men from their own battalions, and put them on somebody else who cannot resist them. That is a matter of my own experience, and, therefore, I fully share my noble friend's strong feeling on this subject.

As regards the case of drunkenness, I was very much relieved to hear the noble Lord the Under-Secretary lay it down that the proper procedure was that a non-commissioned officer charged with drunkenness should be at once brought before a Court-martial, when the ordinary military law would take effect. But I do not quite follow the procedure by which that could be done in the Territorial force. I understand that the matter would have to be reported to the officer in charge of the records. How long would it take before a procedure of that kind would have effect, and would every facility be placed in the way of a commanding officer who tried to use this power? It would be a very serious matter if there was any difficulty in bringing a non-commissioned officer, charged with drunkenness, to justice. I would ask my noble friend the Under-Secretary to make inquiry as to whether commanding officers know the wishes of the Army Council in this respect, so that their powers and duties shall be made clear to them. If this discussion does nothing further than clear up this point, it will have proved a very useful discussion.

RECRUITING FOR THE ARMY.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the last Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, and the recruiting question, and to the War Office Report on the steps taken to provide technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life, and to the War Office Circular Letter relating to the subject [Cd. 3511], 1907; to ask what steps have been taken in addition to those mentioned in the Report aforesaid to carry into effect the recommendations of Sir Edward Ward's Committee as to the teaching of trades to soldiers while serving with the colours; and on what grounds the recommendations of that Committee that soldiers should be required to learn a trade, and should not be required to pay any part of the cost of being taught, except when the instruction and materials are expensive, have not been acted upon; and whether there is any objection to these recommendations being acted upon experimentally, say in one command or in the recruiting for one battalion; and to move for Papers.

Since I had the honour, about eighteen months ago, of raising in your Lordships' House the question of the training of soldiers for civil life, a great deal has happened. The War Office Report and the Circular Letter to which I call attention show that the War Office have taken considerable interest in this matter. The Report contains many shrewd and sensible observations with regard to the necessity of training soldiers for civil life, and, in addition to a good many valuable suggestions, it positively bristles with promises that various plans for teaching soldiers trades shall be considered. I have not the slightest desire to hustle the War Office or unduly to force the pace. I am quite content with promises that certain matters shall be considered, if they are to be considered and not shelved. I note with satisfaction that the scandals mentioned by Lord Donoughmore in connection with the system of giving characters to soldiers have already been dealt with, and that in future regimental characters will be given in a form that will, I hope, render the repetition of such scandals impossible. According to the latest alterations in the form of character, an employer will be given some opportunity of gauging the fitness of ex-soldiers to discharge the duties proposed to be entrusted to them. This is a great step in advance.

Before I deal with the Report, I propose to say something on the recruiting question. I make no apology for including that subject in my Motion, as just now I consider it is a question of unusual importance owing to the very serious amount of unemployment in the country. Recruits of some kind will, no doubt, be easy to get during the winter. But what will they be like? There are plenty of good men seeking work who cannot get it—men who, in the past, have made excellent citizens, and who, no doubt, if they go into the Army, will make excellent soldiers; on the other hand, there are plenty of loafers who are likely to be attracted to the Army by the prospect held out to them, not altogether without warrant, by the recruiting sergeant that they will have an easy time.

If this latter class is allowed to crowd into the Army, the result will be disastrous. Commanding officers will have plenty of choice during the winter months, and should be correspondingly cautious as to the men they take.

The last Report on the British Army shows that the recruits are by no means up to an ideal standard. They are disgracefully ignorant; that is the only term I can use. Out of a total of 17,255 men recruited for the infantry of the Line in the year ended 1st Oct, 1907, 8,497, or very nearly half, either could not read or write at all, or could only read print and write monosyllables from dictation; they were unable to write to the young women with whom they kept company, and if their young women wrote to them they were unable to read the letters. I am not a pedant. I know perfectly well that there have been in the past many persons totally unable to read and write who have, nevertheless, been very shrewd and very energetic. But it is impossible to believe that these recruits could have so successfully evaded the attentions of the school attendance officers as not to have learnt to read and write with some facility. It is almost impossible to conceive the mental stagnation, the complete absence of energy, ambition, and industry, which must characterise a person who deliberately chooses to forget how to read and write. Yet nearly half of our infantry recruits come from that class.

The case would not be so bad if, when they enlisted in the Army, they set to work to make up for lost time. But what do we find? Either they or the Army schoolmaster, or both, would seem to be utterly hopeless. I believe it is the fact—the noble Lord the Under Secretary will correct me if I am wrong—that every man, until he gets a third class certificate of education, is obliged to attend the Army school. I do not know whether this provision is in practice enforced; but, if it is, it seems to have been enforced with absolutely no result. Whatever the amount of schooling they really get may be, the result is not encouraging. Out of 131,886 soldiers at present serving in the Infantry of the Line, 68,726, a little over half — 52 per cent. exactly—are uncertificated.

Now, the third class certificate, unless I am very much mistaken, corresponds with Standard III. in the elementary schools—a standard commonly reached by a child of nine. Those who enter the Army in the print reading stage in nearly every case remain in that stage during the whole of their military career; 49 per cent. of the recruits enter with an education below Standard III., and 48 per cent. of the soldiers remain below Standard III. the whole time they serve with the Colours. What is the Army schoolmaster about? What is the use of keeping Army schoolmasters if they cannot do any more than that? It seems to me a monstrous state of things.

I see, with satisfaction, that the War Office are doing something to remedy this state of things. An Order has lately gone forth to the effect that proficiency pay is to supersede service pay, and that proficiency pay will not be given until the soldier has obtained a third class certificate of education. It is to be hoped that, spurred on by this, the recruit who can only read print, and very little of that, will make the necessary effort to obtain the exalted amount of knowledge requisite to rise into Standard III. This will be sometimes gained. But I venture to think the authorities might go a step further, and keep back some part of the proficiency pay until the soldier has gained a certificate of the second class, which is equal to Standard V. in the elementary schools, with the curious exception, I believe, that the soldier is never taught any geography. That is the standard which is commonly reached by children of eleven. It does not seem an extravagant task to impose upon the Army schoolmaster that he should impart to his pupils during the seven years he has them under him the amount of knowledge commonly possessed by a child of eleven. So much for the ignorance of the recruit, and the astonishing want of success attending the efforts of the Army schoolmaster.

The only other point with regard to recruiting that I wish to mention is that the authorities should deal with perfect fairness with the recruit. For instance, in recruiting for the Territorial force we should not hold out the alluring prospect of the defence of our hearths and homes as the vocation of the force. The hearth and home defence theory used to be much to the fore in civilian circles, but on 16th March last the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for War gave it a final quietus. Interrogated on that occasion—I am quoting from *Hansard*—Lord Lucas said—

> "Mr. Haldane and his advisers do not anticipate that the Territorial Army is going to be able to turn out at once, without further training, to resist the best trained troops that could be put against them."

Therefore, the alluring picture of the Territorials lining the hedges and ditches and repelling raids has been blown into thin air. They are not only not expected to do it, but they could not do it. Yet we find Mr. Arnold-Forster, an ex-Secretary of State for War, Mr. Winston Churchill, and I daresay many other eminent persons, declaring that you must talk about home defence or you will get no recruits for the Territorials.

This is just the kind of humbug that exasperates the soldier, and makes him distrust every official military pronouncement like the hoary old fiction that the pay of the soldier was a shilling a day, when it was well known that necessary stoppages reduced it considerably below that amount. The late Colonel Forrest, when commandant of the Duke of York's School, where only sons of soldiers are admitted, told me it was no use for him to give advice to any boy with regard to enlistment, because there was not a boy who had been six weeks in the school who was not firmly persuaded that the officials, from Colonel Forrest downwards, got 5s. a head for inducing boys to enlist in that branch of the service which was most in need of recruits, and that they never considered what was for the good of the boys themselves. Again, the noble and gallant Viscount, Lord Wolseley, when Adjutant-General, depicted in glowing colours, in a pamphlet which, I believe, is still in circulation, what an excellent preparation an Army training is for civil life, while every Reservist has good reason to know the contrary. The recruiting sergeant is said by the rank and file to be all ribbons and lies, and I am afraid his betters are not much more conscientious in the matter of recruiting. I am happy, however, to think that things are improving, and that the Infantry soldier is not so heavily handicapped as he used to be in seeking civil employment. The heart-breaking barrack square drill has been to some extent superseded by more rational exercises.

As regards the civil employment of ex-soldiers, I am sorry to find that they do not make up in moral qualities what they lack in other respects. I received a letter the other day from Lord Fortescue in which he lamented that the fidelity guarantee companies had recently been obliged to raise their terms of insurance for soldiers employed as stewards or waiters by the Canteen and Mess Co-operative Society. These soldier-stewards and waiters, it seems, are neither more nor less dishonest than civilians in similar employment. The question of employment for ex-soldiers has assumed great importance. I hold in my hand a newspaper circulating largely, I believe, among the rank and file of the Army—it is called *The Regiment*; and I would draw your Lordships' attention to the issue of 18th April last. The principal feature of it is a cartoon entitled "From Soldier to Socialist." The cartoon contains four squares; the picture in the first is that of a soldier on active service, that in the second of a soldier who applies to the War Office for work and cannot get it, that in the third of the soldier entering the casual ward, and that in the fourth of the soldier as a socialist orator addressing an excited audience who are waving red flags. The letterpress at the bottom of the cartoon states that—

> "The above illustrates the four stages in one of the most astonishing of modern metamorphoses. Statistics have recently been published proving the high percentage of soldiers forced into vagrancy; and in a crowd of 500 unemployed socialistic demonstrators in London recently 300 were ex-soldiers—the instance is but typical of a growing calamity solely engendered by official callousness and public apathy as regards the treatment of ex-soldiers. We indicate the danger to the authorities. What will they do to obviate it?"

In another part of the same issue of *The Regiment* I find this statement—

> "The sterling, unimpeachable worth of ex-soldiers in the aggregate is convincingly proved by the fact that they are not all socialist agitators."

The remedy indicated in this newspaper is that there should be more preferential employment for soldiers. The noble Earl beside me says, "Hear, hear." I hope he will give me his attention for a moment or two.

The advocates of an extension of preferential employment are between the devil and the deep sea. While, on the one hand, the soldier is clamouring for more preferential employment, the amount of such employment already given is making the Army unpopular with the working man, and is, moreover, detrimental to the public service. If any one disputes that fact, let him read the evidence given on behalf of the Post Office before Sir E. Ward's Committee. It is there stated by a Post Office official that 40 per cent. of the telegraph boys are unable to obtain situations as postmen on leaving the telegraph service, owing to the preference given to ex-soldiers. The result is that we get an inferior class of telegraph boy because their future is not assured. We also get an inferior class of postmen, for it is found that ex-telegraph boys make better postmen than ex-soldiers. Moreover, this further result follows, that the Army is unpopular with telegraph boys who can seldom be induced to enlist.

Soldiers may justly claim a certain amount of preferential employment. Active service or other circumstances may prevent a soldier from having an opportunity of fitting himself for civil life. Such cases it is the duty of the State to take in hand, and those persons could easily be accommodated in preferential berths without anybody being any the worse. But it is open to grave doubt whether the system of preferential employment has not been carried further than is consistent with the true welfare of the Army. It is a serious matter to render the Army unpopular with the working classes. The working man who is passed over for a job in favour of an ex-soldier, not because the ex-soldier is the better man but because he is an ex-soldier, naturally nourishes a grudge against the Army; and the ex-soldier who returns to his village having neglected every opportunity to qualify himself for civil life because he relies on obtaining preferential employment operates as a warning to his neighbours against enlisting. Any system which foists men into positions for any other reason except that they are fit for them is bound to give endless trouble and worry. Preferential employment for ex-soldiers has been tried for a generation. It cannot be carried further without doing more harm than good.

There remains the common sense expedient which for many years I have been endeavouring to urge upon the authorities, and against which nothing can be said—the expedient of teaching the soldier to rely for employment on his own merits. On this proposition the War Office have promised to consider further various plans that have been laid before them. This is all very well, but there is very little information in the Papers laid before the House as to how far the process of teaching soldiers a trade has been carried. We learn that on a small scale gardening has been a success, and also motor driving. I am told that it is dangerous for pedestrians to go past the Knightsbridge Barracks after dark on account of the number of amateur soldier *chauffeurs* who are continually practising. That is so far satisfactory.

The thoroughly unsatisfactory part of the Report is its pronouncement, without giving any reason, against the principle of compulsion advocated by Sir E. Ward's Committee. This pronouncement is the more remarkable as the chief obstacle to the success of the present scheme is stated to be the apathy of the men as to their future. That, not doubt, was precisely the difficulty that Sir E. Ward's Committee foresaw and desired to guard against. If, as I suspect, the cost has deterred the War Office from formulating a comprehensive and compulsory scheme of instruction for the men, or the fear of a falling off of recruits, let a compulsory scheme be tried as I suggest in one command, or in one battalion, where recruiting is brisk; there would be no danger of a shortage in the supply of recruits, nor would the expense be great. Of course, if there is compulsion the other recommendation of the Committee which has been ignored must also be acted upon, and instruction involving no considerable expense must be given free; otherwise the terms of service will be altered. Besides, one can hardly expect that persons who have enlisted with the object of not being obliged to learn a trade would pay to learn one. I want such persons to keep out of the Army which they bring into discredit, and the best way to keep them out is to let them know that they will be obliged to work at a trade.

What a terrible set of fellows these ignorant loafers must be in barracks! No wonder the industrious and reputable citizen is shy of entering the Army, when half his comrades in barracks are still in the first or second standard or below any standard at all. When people talk of the difficulty of keeping the Army up to its establishment, they take note of the recruits who would be driven away by the prospect of industrial training, but they do not take note of the large number of respectable and adventurous persons who would be attracted to the Army by the prospect of learning a trade and of keeping respectable and well-informed company. The winner of a prize of £100 for a military essay—Captain Dunlop—says the Army should be the poor man's university. I am afraid your Lordships will regard that as a counsel of perfection. If we have a course of training here we must, of course, make provision for India and the Colonies. In India the soldier is taught, among other things, fine needlework; and Lord Pirrie told me that he found a number of soldiers in Netley Hospital invalided from India who were comfortably engaged on needlework, while others who had not that resource looked thoroughly bored. Any industrial occupation is better than none.

For more than half the day during half the year the soldier is not required to do anything but amuse himself according to his lights. He may be as ignorant as he pleases when he enlists, and he may remain as ignorant as he pleases all the time he is with the colours. Official documents dealing with the advantages of a military life portray either such a complete ignorance of common facts, or such a wilful disregard of them, that the rank and file of the Army refuse to take such documents seriously, and teach their offspring that they must regard with the utmost suspicion any statement emanating from an official source and any advice given by an official. With regard to the civil career of the soldier, which is, after all, to him the chief concern of his life, very few officers have taken the trouble to see that he is fitted for any civilian employment, but they have taken immense pains to foist him into situations which would otherwise have been filled by more competent persons, to the injury of the public service and the indignation of the labouring classes.

The British officer, I am afraid, does not take any great interest in the process of making the Army popular. His energies are concentrated on making it an efficient fighting machine. While the civilian must be content to bow to military authority on questions relating to the military efficiency of the Army, it is the work of the civilian to see that the Army is popular with the mass of the people—a most important problem on which the safety of the Empire may depend. So long as the Army is popular the people will keep it up to sufficient strength, but if the Army becomes unpopular no one can predict what will happen. This is a problem the civilian must think out for himself, and I have endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to contribute my mite towards its solution. As to my Motion for Papers, I think the noble Lord the Under-Secretary will recognise that it is quite time we knew what the War Office have been doing during the last eighteen months.

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers showing the steps taken by the War Office to provide technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*Lord HAVERSHAM: My Lords, I should like to say one or two words on the Motion which the noble Lord has for three years in succession brought forward in your Lordships' House. He raised it in November, 1906, in May 1907, and again in November, 1908; it therefore comes before us as a very healthy and hardy annual. At the same time my noble friend must be congratulated on the great steps in advance that have been taken by the War Office since he last called attention to the matter. One step in advance has been the increase from £1,000 to £2,500 in the sum granted for teaching soldiers trades.

But before I say anything on the subject of teaching trades, I should like to correct the false colouring which my noble friend has put upon the state of recruiting, and upon the character and quality of the men who have been recruited. In the last Report on recruiting appears this statement—

> "The class of recruits is undoubtedly improving. The consensus of reports from the districts is to this effect. The pay, the additional comforts, and the prospects of the soldier are having a marked effect."

Therefore we need not adopt such a despairing view of the condition of recruits as that taken by my noble friend. I am also glad to see from the Army Reports that, last year, of the 31,044 men who left the Army and returned to civil life with characters either good or exemplary, no fewer than 24,179 have either been provided with employment or found situations. I would also remind your Lordships that there are at this moment employed on the railway systems of this country no fewer than 20,000 men who have served in the ranks.

My noble friend referred to what he described as the very illiterate character of the recruits. I cannot understand how he makes that out, because I find, on page 94, with regard to the educational attainment of recruits, that there were 23,235 recruits examined, out of whom more than 20,000 appeared in Class A, Class B, and Class C. All the men in those classes can read and write. When we look to the class to which the noble Lord alluded, we find that there are only 2,254 in Class D; and that in the lowest class, those who failed to pass into Class D, there is not a single one. Therefore I think there must be some mistake in the figures which the noble Lord gave.

For the learning of a trade the important years are the last two of a man's service. It is impossible for the young soldier for a few years after he joins to go to school, do his drill and musketry training, and in addition learn a trade; but if it were pointed out to him, within a few years of leaving the service, how handicapped he would be against the civilian in seeking for employment unless he knew a trade, he would no doubt avail himself of the opportunity of fitting himself for civil life. In every regiment, at present, there are tailors' and shoemakers' shops and cooks' kitchens, in which the men can learn useful vocations; and I would suggest that carpentry is another trade which might be agreeably taught to the soldier at little expense. We all know that there is no more satisfactory mode of securing a better class and a larger number of recruits than by providing them with some means of obtaining employment after they have left the service.

LORD SAYE AND SELE: My Lords, I understood the noble Lord who initiated this discussion to say that the ex-soldier was less honest than the civilian.

LORD MONKSWELL: I said he was neither more nor less honest.

LORD SAYE AND SELE: The noble Lord also said that the soldier returned to civil life at the end of his time a worse man.

LORD MONKSWELL: I said he sometimes did.

LORD SAYE AND SELE: My experience is exactly the reverse. Anyone who has sat in a recruiting officer's chair knows that we have always recruited the Army from a low grade of society. Recruits enter very illiterate, but they do not leave the Army quite so illiterate. Coming as he does from such a low class of society, the recruit has a great deal to learn, and by the time he has been taught his drill, and to be obedient, clean, and sober, he has very little time left for learning a trade. If I had known that this point was to be discussed, I would have looked the matter up; but, if I am not mistaken, this subject was very carefully gone into some years ago, and it was found to be practically impossible to teach soldiers any trades beyond those now taught. As to the noble Lord's remarks regarding preferential employment, I entirely disagree that the posts given to the soldier now are preferential. They are not. They are given to him because discipline, cleanliness, and obedience, as taught to him during the time he was in the Army, have fitted him to fill them.

*LORD LUCAS: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Lord who raised this question intended to charge me with a breach of faith in regard to my statement that the Territorial force, which is statutorily enlisted for service at home, may not necessarily be able, during the first few days of war, to face an enemy who might land on these shores. The Territorial Force has never been considered in any other light than as a home defence Army, and the fact that it will have to undergo a certain amount of training on mobilisation does not make it any the less a home defence Army. The noble Lord quoted a letter from Lord Fortescue, with regard to the dishonesty of ex-soldiers, which he did me the kindness to let me read the other day. If my recollection is not playing me false, I remember Lord Fortescue saying, that in the case of which he spoke it had been necessary to increase the premiums of ex-soldier waiters, but that civilian waiters were uninsurable altogether.

*LORD MONKSWELL: I did not wish to state publicly the other portion of Lord Fortescue's letter, but, as the noble Lord has challenged me, I must do so. Lord Fortescue's statement was that waiters and stewards from the Navy were uninsurable.

*LORD LUCAS: I am sorry I misread the letter. As to the character of recruits enlisted and how far they are illiterate, I beg to thank Lord Haversham for what he said on that subject. He showed that in both these matters a great improvement has been effected. I now come to the general question of employment. As your Lordships know, this is a big and important question, and one which greatly affects recruiting for the Army. But when you proceed to work out the question of how you are to establish a universal system of training such as that to which the noble Lord has referred, you are at once met by a number of difficulties, and also by the consideration whether or not such a system is really necessary. This matter has been studied rather closely lately, and, as far as we are able to tell—we have not the full Returns on the subject—75 per cent. of the men in the Army pass straight into one trade or another the moment they leave. In many cases they have learnt their trade in the Army, and in other cases they have business connections of one form or another. The remaining 25 per cent. present a problem, but the fact of such a high percentage at once finding trades makes it extremely doubtful whether it is either economically necessary or wise to start a difficult and expensive system of universal teaching. That is the first point.

There is another difficulty which confronts us. As my noble friend Lord Haversham said, it is in the last two years of a man's service in the Army that the learning of a trade would be of the greatest use. The great majority of soldiers in the British Army spend the last two years of their service in India, and that increases the difficulty of instruction. But there are a certain number who do not go to India, and they are the men who are learning trades now. I doubt very much whether what the soldier had learnt in the way of a trade in his earlier years in the Army before going to India would be of very great use to him on leaving the Army four or five years afterwards. After all, it is not very easy for a soldier to learn a trade thoroughly while in the Army. The noble Lord spoke of the idle life led by a soldier. I wish the noble Lord would visit Aldershot and see of what the soldier's life really consists.

LORD MONKSWELL: Yes, in the summer.

*LORD LUCAS: In summer and winter; it is exactly the same thing. Training in which everything possible is being done to develop individual intelligence is being carried on in an extraordinary degree, and when I was last there I was told that practically the only time left free from military duties of one kind or another was Saturday afternoon, on which the men play football or other games. No doubt they do have other leisure time, but not sufficient for the giving of thorough instruction in a trade. Nevertheless, the thing has been started, and at Aldershot, as elsewhere, they have been working out teaching methods in the way best suited to local conditions. I am glad to say that the results have been satisfactory, although there have been great difficulties in finding the necessary appliances and the necessary means of teaching the men trades. Difficulty has also been experienced in getting the men to stick to the course. A large proportion have sometimes started, but not many have gone through the course. In the circumstances it would be useless and wasteful to make the course universal; it must be voluntary, and I think it is right that the soldier should be asked to contribute to the expense, if only as a guarantee that he is in earnest and that the money is not being expended in vain.

LORD MONKSWELL: Has the noble Lord any objection to the recommendation of Sir Edward Ward's Committee being tried, that the instruction should be compulsory and that the soldier should not be asked to pay any part except for expensive teaching?

*LORD LUCAS: We do not propose to make it universal, chiefly for the reason I have given, that in the case of 75 per cent. of the men it is not considered necessary. Nor do we propose to make it free of charge, although a grant is given every year towards the cost. We now ask the soldier to contribute, and we shall continue to ask him to contribute, towards the expense of learning a trade. We shall be glad to lay a Paper on the Table, and I hope your Lordships, when you see it, will think that it is a satisfactory record. The scheme is, to a certain extent, experimental, but some 3,000 men have had an opportunity of learning eighty-eight trades, and I think it is succeeding on the whole extremely well.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, this question has engaged the serious attention of the War Office for many years, and I desire to say a word in appreciation of what has been done by the present Government in regard to it.

I confess I do not share altogether the somewhat pessimistic views expressed by the noble Lord who opened the discussion. I think all attempts, under successive Ministers, to make either the training or education in the Army compulsory or universal beyond a certain standard are almost bound to fail in a voluntary Army. I do not think that sufficient stress was laid by the noble Lord who opened the discussion on the extreme difficulty, within the short time which is allotted to the British soldier to learn his duties, of adding anything to the number of duties which already fall upon him. I am sure that regimental officers in the House will bear me out that the greatest difficulty already exists during the summer in getting in all the training and shooting instruction necessary to fit soldiers for the efficient discharge of their military duties.

The noble Lord will, perhaps, say: "Why not give up a portion of the winter, when the same amount of drill and military training is not required, to the learning of trades?" I can assure your Lordships, speaking from personal experience, that it has been represented over and over again to the War Office that if you wish to increase the number and improve the class of recruits, you will do it not by adding to the amount of their teaching while in the service, but by making somewhat easier the terms on which a soldier is bound to perform his duty during the period of his service, as, for example, through longer furlough, and the infusion of a little more elasticity in other arrangements. Therefore, in the winter I think every good commanding officer will do his best to let as many men as possible off duty. I see one or two officers behind me who could tell your Lordships in how many different directions, such as signalling and the like, time is now occupied which was not occupied before. For that reason, when attempts have been made to introduce regimental instruction in various trades great difficulties have been experienced and we have not received the support from the soldiers themselves which we had hoped for. The same is true of education. Education was compulsory in the Army during a long period, and when the system ceased to be compulsory and became voluntary the percentage of certificates rose, which shows that it was formerly looked upon as a drill in which it was not necessary to show excellence.

I have not risen to make a speech, but only to urge one point. I believe that the Returns which the Government have furnished as to the efforts made to give the advantage of training show a distinct advance on any previous efforts which have been made. Any soldier who desires to learn a trade is more likely now to enjoy the opportunity as compared with ten or fifteen years ago. Another subject of congratulation is that 75 per cent. of those who leave the Army find employment without unnecessary delay. That in itself is a great advance, and I do not agree that by the imposition of any hard and fast rules you are likely to add substantially to recruiting. The late Sir Redvers Buller once said to me that there were 30,000 men in England who would join the Army every year under any conditions, some because they had an ambition to a military career, and others because they were driven to it by failure to get work. He added that what we get beyond 30,000 are partly due to the pay and the attractions and partly to unemployment and other fortuitous circumstances, but that we cannot expect to get much over 40,000 men under present terms and conditions. I believe that there is a universal feeling among authorities that increase of pay, improvement in barrack accommodation, the opportunity of getting employment after a man leaves the Colours, have all tended, speaking generally, to raise the character and the class of men who join the service. I believe there has been a marked improvement in recent years in that respect, and, though I feel certain that the War Office will not relax their efforts to make the scheme as universal as possible, I am quite sure that they are wise and prudent in leaving these attempt voluntary and allowing soldiers the opportunity, if they desire, to receive this instruction, without enforcing it upon them as part of their military service.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I desire to make one or two observations in reply to Lord Haversham, who has accused me of having misread page 94 of the last annual Report of the British Army. The noble Lord said that the Report showed that in the last recruiting no one was placed in Class E. The reason why no recruit was placed in that class is that Class E. did not exist until the last few months; and, if we take the old classification, what I said was absolutely correct. Half of the men are in Class C and Class D.

*LORD HAVERSHAM: There are over 20,000 out of 23,000 in the first three classes.

LORD MONKSWELL: Yes, but I take the men in Class C. as being under Standard III.

*LORD HAVERSHAM: They are men who can read and write.

LORD MONKSWELL: They can only read from print. They cannot, as I said, read or write a letter. When the noble Viscount opposite talks about the great difficulties in the way of making this system compulsory, he must be perfectly aware that Sir Edward Ward and his Committee, who were quite as conversant with what goes on at Aldershot as the noble Viscount, said that, notwithstanding the difficulties of granting furlough in the winter, it was their opinion that the soldier should be required to learn a trade, but not to pay for it unless he wanted teaching of an exceptional and expensive character. Sir Edward Ward's Committee may be wrong, but I have that Report at my back in urging, as I do, that at least the experiment should be tried in one battalion of giving effect to the recommendations of the Ward Committee, and by the result I shall be quite content to stand or fall. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary said I accused him of breach of faith with regard to the Territorials. I have never said the Territorials might not be useful to some extent as an army of defence. But they are told that they will be called upon to line the ditches and hedges and repel a raid, whereas they will be required to do nothing of the kind, and anybody who has been led to join on that ground is not being dealt with fairly.

*LORD LUCAS: How does the noble Lord propose that they shall be used if they are not to be called out in the event of a raid?

LORD MONKSWELL: They are not to be called out to resist a raid.

*LORD LUCAS: The Territorial Force is a home defence force for the purpose of meeting raids or any other form of hostile landing on our shores, and the fact that that force might not be able to take the field against trained troops immediately on the outbreak of war does not prevent it being a home defence force.

LORD MONKSWELL: I did not say it was not a home defence force, though I feel that when the country gets into difficulties it will be difficult for the Volunteer not to join the Regular Army. My point is that, over and over again, the Territorial Army have been told that it will be their duty to repel a raid, but when the noble Lord was questioned on that point in your Lordships' House his reply was that neither Mr. Haldane nor his advisers supposed, for a moment, that the Territorial Force could take part in repelling a sudden raid. In my opinion the Territorial Army will not be entirely an army for home defence. When the Territorial is wanted abroad, as in South Africa, I have no doubt he will go abroad.

*LORD LUCAS: The noble Lord is quite entitled to his own opinions, but I wish he would not attach my name to them.

LORD MONKSWELL: I daresay the noble Lord disagrees with me, and thinks that the Territorial Force will be entirely required for home defence. My belief is that persons are induced to enlist in the Territorial Force by being told that they will have to line the hedges and ditches to repel a sudden raid; yet, when questioned on that point, the noble Lord the Under-Secretary stated that they would not be called upon to repel a sudden raid because they could not do so.

THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I should like to say one word about the cavalry. I do not know what time the infantry may have on their hands, but there are certainly serious difficulties lying in the way of any attempt to teach a trade to the cavalry soldier. This man has to learn the hard trade of being a good cavalry soldier, though it is possible for many cavalrymen to learn a trade useful in civil life in the saddler's and tailors' shops. The noble Lord said the soldier has a great deal of time on his hands, especially in the winter; but I would point out that in the cavalry the man probably has to groom a couple of horses and has to do it three times a day. I venture to say that in the cavalry a man has more to do than many of your Lordships' coachmen and grooms, in addition to his soldiering and drill, and I should like to know how many coachmen and grooms, when they have done their day's work, would be inclined to learn or even capable of learning another trade. My noble friend Lord Clanwilliam, who has been an adjutant not long ago, tells me that even during the winter months it was as much as he was able to do to teach the men what they had to learn from a soldier's point of view, and that they had absolutely no time to learn any trade.

LORD MONKSWELL: I can only speak again by the indulgence of the House; but I should like to mention that the General Officer who introduced this question in the House of Commons year after year with great persistency but with very little success was himself a cavalry officer. I have no doubt that both in the infantry and the cavalry the men have now much less leisure than formerly, and there is consequently less reason, perhaps, why they should be required to learn a trade. I hope, however, that the War Office will persist in their endeavour to induce soldiers who have the time to learn a trade, the better to fit themselves for employment on their return to civil life.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 16th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Northamptonshire against; to lie upon the Table.

TRAWLING IN PROHIBITED AREAS PREVENTION BILL.

Petition from Nairn, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Nelson, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Order granted to Mary Anne Spillane, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, 195, Mare Street, Hackney, E. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copies presented, of Colonial Report, No. 584 (Report on the work of the Imperial Institute for 1906–7); No. 585 (Barbadoes, Report for 1907–8) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to a proposal to recruit labour in

Madagascar for employment in the Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, etc., for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under The Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report on the Judicial Statistics of Scotland for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Copies presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Copy presented, of Return of the amount of the Notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 28th October, 1908, which have been written off [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Murders in the Metropolitan Police District.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of murders that have taken place in the Metropolitan Police district from 1st January, 1903, until the present date; and in how many cases the perpetrator has not been discovered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The following figures, supplied by the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, give the information desired. Cases of infanticide (murder of children under the age of one year) are not included:—

(1) Year.	(2) Total number of murders committed	(3) Number included in Column 2 in which the perpetrator has not been discovered
1903 - - -	17	—
1904 - - -	20	2
1905 - - -	19	1
1906 - - -	15	2
1907 - - -	11	3
1908, to 30th September - -	10	2
Total - -	92	10

Four of the ten murders included in the third column as cases in which the perpetrators have not been discovered were cases in which women had died as the results of illegal operations, one in each of the years 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1908. I have included in this column not only the cases in which the criminal has not been traced but also those in which the police possess information which convinces them that only one person could have committed the crime, but have found it impossible to obtain the legal evidence necessary to justify his or her arrest or, in case of arrest, to secure his or her conviction.

Increased Pay for Auxiliary Rural Postmen.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General, whether the increased pay recommended by the Parliamentary Committee to auxiliary rural postmen in Ireland has yet been paid to them; if not, when will it; and whether it will be retrospective from the date of the recommendation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Instructions to pay the higher rates have been given at a number of offices in Ireland, and the work of checking the claims from the remaining offices is proceeding as rapidly as possible. It will be completed very shortly. The higher rates of pay take effect from 1st January, 1908.

German Customs Union and the Registration of Merchandise.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the rules governing the registration of merchandise imported into or exported from the German Customs Union, printed on page 57 of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Trade Records, is a correct translation of the rules existing, respectively, prior and subsequent to 1st March, 1906; and whether, especially, Sections 3 and 4 do not exclusively relate to rules prior to 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As stated in the Report, only extracts from the rules in force prior to and since 1st March, 1906, have been translated. I understand that the translation given is substantially correct. The rules under head B (in force from 1st March, 1906), including Sections 3 and 4, to which the honourable Member specially refers, form part of a decree of the Federal Council, dated 9th February, 1906, resolving to approve the rules and to put them in force from 1st March, 1906, in substitution for those then in force.

War Office's Stores purchased from Foreign Firms.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary of State for War, if he can state the total amount involved in the contracts for general stores and other manufactured articles secured by foreign firms during the last two years; and if he will classify the goods in question and state what sum has been saved to the Exchequer by making those purchases abroad instead of in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)—Manufactured Articles * ordered from abroad (including those obtained through agents in this country).

Article.	Value of contracts, 1906-7.	Value of contracts, 1907-8.
	£	£
Acetone - - -	22,925	72,203
Air-composer - -	—	193
Aluminium - -	—	297
Ambulance, cycle -	22	—
Ammeters - -	—	—
Antimony, regulus -	1,179	255
,, sulphide	31	16
Apparatus, wireless telegraphy - -	—	—
Apparatus, self-registering - -	—	—
Apparatus, pattern-producing - -	—	—
Asbestos fibre - -	108	—
Billiard balls, bonzoline - - -	71	221
Binoculars and parts	196	312
Blocks, pulley -	—	—
,, chain -	24	—
Board leather and straw - -	10	151
Bottles, water -	52	—
Brandy - - -	—	547
Bugles, &c. -	—	—
Butter - - -	171	—
Carbons, electric light	—	3
Carbon shot - -	—	106
Cartridge cases -	—	—
Castings, steel -	—	—
Chairs - - -	—	1,337
Chalk, prepared -	—	36

Article.	Value of contracts, 1906-7.	Value of contracts. 1907-8.
	£	£
Champagne - -	292	152
Chlorate of potash -	17	—
Clocks and watches	50	90
Cocoa - - -	75	—
Coils, porcelain -	—	—
Cooperite - -	—	50
Copper ingot - -	167,609	82,877
Counters, revolution	—	—
De-magnetiser -	17	—
Discs, "Suberits" -	—	51
Drums, acid - -	—	223
Duck suits - -	—	58
Fezzes - - -	—	—
Forceps - - -	—	18
Forks, flesh - -	—	29
Furnaces, gas - -	—	146
Gauges, Swedish -	—	178
Girders, steel - -	—	—
Globes and Chimneys, Lamps, &c. - -	1,248	1,852
Gun stocks - -	67,602	32,641
Heel balls - -	—	1
Hoists, pneumatic -	—	—
Iron, pig - -	281	279
Knives, cooks' -	—	—
Lamps, electric, arc, and parts - -	169	—
Lamps, brazing -	—	35
,, candle -	158	25
Lamps, paint removing. - - -	23	—

Articles.	Value of contracts, 1906–7.	Value of contracts, 1907–8.
	£	£
Machines, blower and heating. - -	—	—
Machine tools, etc. -	3,599	3,361
Mats, Russia - -	—	—
Meat extract - -	—	4,237
,, preserved -	52,288	39,543
Milk, condensed -	776	—
Mortors, electric, etc.	—	—
Nails, Wire - -	—	1,069
Ovens, Sulphur -	—	—
Pads, gas, check -	—	—
Plant, acid, and parts	—	—
Potash, Black - -	822	253
Potatoes, preserved -	321	76
Protectors, ear -	7	—
Rails and Fishplates	—	—
Reflectors, projectors	—	—
Rope, wood, wool -	—	—
Saws, band - -	—	62
Shoes and nails, horse, mule and pony. -	1,924	4,060
Silk cloth - -	—	688
Stamps, dating -	—	—
Steel, Styrian - -	91	60
Sterilisers and parts -	—	—
Sticks, carborundum	—	—
Stones, oil - -	30	—
Stoves - - -	44	36
Sugar, crystalised -	1,861	—
Swords, practice -	37	64

Articles.	Value of contracts, 1906-7.	Value of contracts, 1907-8.
	£	£
Telephones, &c. -	647	1,360
Tools, screw-cutting, &c. - - -	272	122
Tumblers and bottles, glass - - -	—	527
Vegetables, compressed - -	94	—
Vices - - -	—	19
Wagons - - -	—	—
Wheels and rims, emery - - -	441	76
Totals - - -	325,584*	250,015

*The lists for 1906-7 and 1907-8 include all goods classed as manufactured in the Board of Trade Monthly Accounts, *e.g.*, copper ingots, gun stocks, preserved meat, crystalised sugar. Previously the Return was based on a somewhat narrower interpretation of the term "manufactured articles."

Members of the Government and Special Police Patrols.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary for State for the Home Department whether any members of the present Government are having the privilege of special police being stationed outside the doors of their private residences; and, if so, will he specify the names of those Ministers enjoying this special privilege and state the reason why this privilege is conferred, and also the extra cost involved and who is defraying that cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not aware what precise measures are being taken. In any case in which any individual members of the public are liable to annoyance, the Commissioner of Police takes such steps as he considers to be required to prevent the annoyance and to maintain order. The matter is one of police administration with which I am not prepared to interfere. No extra cost is involved.

Scottish School Board Electors.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland how many new voters are estimated to be enfranchised for school board elections in Scotland under the new Education Act, and of what classes they will consist.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The proposals of the Bill will admit to vote at school board elections all householders with rentals under £4 who are disqualified by the existing school board franchise and also persons other than householders who are entitled to vote at Parliamentary elections. It is not possible to give any estimate of the number of these classes respectively.

MR. WATT: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his Department has formed any estimate of how many electors who have up till now voted in school board elections will be disfranchised under the Education (Scotland) Bill if it passes into law, on account of the fact that parish council registers will then be utilised; if so, will he say of whom these disfranchised voters will consist; and how many they are estimated to be.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The only persons at present qualified to vote at school board elections who will not have a vote under the proposals of the Bill will be those not qualified to vote at Parliamentary and parish council elections on account of non-payment of rates. Certain other persons such as joint owners or occupiers whose names appear automatically on the school board roll as being on the valuation roll will, in future, require to make application to be placed upon the roll. It is not possible to make any satisfactory estimate of the number of these persons.

Assassination of a Bengali Detective.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information regarding the assassination of the Bengali detective Nundo Lal Bannerjee; whether this is the man who traced the anarchist who threw the bomb which killed Mrs. and Miss Kennedy; and whether the murderers have been apprehended.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) Nundo Lal Bannerjee was murdered in a dark and narrow lane at about 7 p.m. on 9th November. The murder was witnessed by a number of shopkeepers, who state that the murderers were two young Bengalees. A reward of Rs. 5,000 has been offered. No arrests have yet been made. The murdered man was the officer who traced Profulla Chaki, one of the perpetrators of the Muzzaffarpur outrage, to Mokaneh railway station, where Profulla shot himself to avoid arrest.

Distribution of Untenanted Lands on the Reynell Estate.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, S.): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received a memorial from the tenants on the Reynell Estate, County Meath, suggesting that the untenanted land on the estate should be purchased and distributed among the occupiers of uneconomic holdings and the descendants of evicted tenants on the estate; and if the prayer of the petition will be acceded to.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A communication on behalf of these tenants has been addressed to the Estates Commissioners asking them to acquire the untenanted land on the estate. The matter will be considered when the estate is being dealt with under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Tenants and Land of the Congested Districts Board.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the extent of land now in the hands of the Congested Districts Board, and the number of tenants under the board; whether fair rents have recently been fixed on a number of holdings held by tenants direct from the board; whether he will state how many head of cattle and sheep the Congested Districts Board had for sale at the last great autumn fair of Ballinasloe in October last; on what lands they are grazed; and why these lands have not been divided up in farms for the landless or for the enlargement of uneconomic holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The extent of tenanted and untenanted land now in the hands of the Congested Districts Board is 286,347 acres. The number of tenants on these lands is 7,590. Fair rents have been fixed in the case of 12 of these tenants during the past year. The board sold 256 cattle and 98 sheep at Ballinasloe fair; these had been grazed on the Longford, Oldtown, Oatfield, and Newcastle farms. The existing limitation upon the powers of the board as to the disposal of land has hitherto made it difficult to deal with these farms. The question of extending the board's powers in this regard will be dealt with in the forthcoming Bill.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the making of voluntary purchase agreements under the Irish Land Act, 1903, cannot proceed while the future conditions of land purchase are in doubt; and whether, having regard to the practical impossibility of passing into law a large and comprehensive Land Bill without months of delay, he intends to submit any proposals for avoiding the complete stoppage of land-purchase operations.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Purchase agreements are still being lodged at considerably above the average rate. For the proposals of the Government I must ask the hon. Member to await the introduction of the Irish Land Bill, which I hope will take place on Monday next.

Road Improvements at Woolwich.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the London County Council proposes to apply to Parliament in the session of 1909 for authority to reconstruct for electric traction the tramways from the Lord Howick public-house *via* Albion Road and George Street to Chapel Street, Woolwich; whether he will co-operate with the council in widening, where necessary, the portion of the route outside the royal dockyard by adding to the public way the narrow strip of the dockyard needed for such an improvement, in order that the necessary paving, etc., work may be put in hand at an early date with a view to providing suitable employment for a number of persons, and in order that the reconstruction of the tramway, if and when sanctioned by Parliament, may be undertaken without delay; and whether, if satisfactory arrangements be made with the council, the work will be put in hand by the Government without delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The War Department is prepared to grant the strip of land in question for the purposes of widening the road provided suitable terms can be arranged with the London County Council. It is not anticipated that there will be any difficulty in arriving at the terms. Every endeavour will be made to facilitate the progress of the work, but it must be remembered that, before the existing wall can be demolished, the new wall must at least in part be completed for the protection of the arsenal.

Christchurch Sewage Scheme.

Mr. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Secretary of State for War when it is expected that the Army Council will be in a position to give their decision with regard to the new sewerage scheme of the borough of Christchurch; and whether in view of the fact that a representative of the Royal Engineers inspected the plans so long ago as 21st September, he will undertake to expedite the matter, and so put an end to the inconvenience which the delay is causing.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The decision of the Army Council was communicated to the town clerk on the 12th instant.

Patent Rights of Mr. J. Bielefeld, of Hammersmith.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will look into the case of Julius Bielefeld, of 48, Bassein Park Road, Hammersmith, who states that an invention, for which he was granted letters patent, has been used by the Government without payment of the royalties claimed by him, although the amount of such royalties was never objected to by the authorities; and, if so, what reward he will advise should be given to him.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Mr. Bielefeld has been paid the royalty granted for all nosebags obtained by the War Department that are covered by his patent. The nosebags now obtained by the Department are not covered by his patent, and no royalty therefore can be paid in regard to them.

Clerical Staff of Post Office Provincial Superintending Engineer's Offices.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the scheme of reorganising the clerical force in provincial superintending engineers' offices is yet complete; whether it embodies a proposal to employ permanently assistant clerks (abstractors) in those offices; and, if so, will he indicate the probable date on which this proposal is to take effect.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A revision of the staff in provincial superintending engineers' offices is at present under consideration, and in the meantime I am unable to furnish particulars of future arrangements or to say when they will come into operation.

Post Office Clerks and the Washing of Office Towels.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Postmaster-General under what regulation Post Office clerks have now, for the first time, to bear the cost of the provision and washing of the towels in Post Office lavatories; and whether in view of the fact that the use of towels is rendered necessary by their employment, he will rescind the regulation in question.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am not aware of any alteration of rule bearing on the subject. If the hon. Member will be good enough to let me have the name of the particular office that he has in mind, I will have inquiry made.

School Fees in Scotland.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland what total sum would be received by the school board of Aberdeen providing it received the same sum for each pupil in average attendance as will be received respectively by the authorities in Dumfriesshire Forfarshire, Peeblesshire, and Perthshire respectively, under his second allocation of the balance of £436,500.

Mr. PIRIE : To ask the Secretary for Scotland what sum on the average will be received by the local authorities in Aberdeen, Dumfriesshire, Forfarshire, Peeblesshire, and Perthshire, respectively, for each pupil in average attendance in board schools and other State-aided schools under his second scheme of allocation of the balance of £436,500; and what sum would they receive on the average if this balance were equally divided amongst the authorities with sole regard to the pupils in average attendance.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to similar Questions put to-day by the hon. Member for South Lanark.

Ground Purchased for School at Cathcart Bridge.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire) : To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will say what was the area of the ground recently purchased by the Cathcart School Board at Holmlea Road, Cathcart Bridge, as a site for a public school; what was the date of the purchase, what was the price paid for it, and what was taken at the time of the purchase as its annual value for rating, or, if it formed part of a larger subject, by how much the annual value for rating of that larger subject has been reduced by reason of the severance of the purchased portion.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed that the area of the site in question is 6,886 square yards, and that the purchase was completed in April, 1908, the net price paid being £3,270 17s. The site formed part of a larger subject which was let at a rent of £2 9s. 10d. an acre, and I understand the rent has been reduced *pro rata* in consequence of the sale.

Civil Service Clerkships.

Sir G. KEKEWICH (Exeter) : To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that many boy clerks will complete their terms of service during the next twelve months, and that during that period the examinations for Second Division clerkships are to be wholly suspended, and the examinations for assistant clerkships and assistants of Excise and Customs are being postponed, he will state how the Treasury propose to deal with boy clerks who will attain twenty years of age in the period during which those examinations are suspended or postponed.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) It is not anticipated that there will be any postponement of the examinations for assistant clerkships during the next twelve months, or that examinations for the Second Division will be wholly suspended during that period. The postponement of the competitions for the Second Division and for assistantships of Excise and Customs will not shut out boy clerks who reach the age of twenty during the next twelve months for the general regulations allow reductions of age to be made for boy clerk service.

International Copyright Convention.

Mr. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton) : To ask the President of the Board of Trade when the decisions of the International Copyright Conference are likely to be arrived at, and whether he will cause them to be communicated to the House; and whether any of the decisions can be put into effect until they have been submitted to and sanctioned by Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The final sitting of the Conference took place on Saturday last and His Majesty's Government are awaiting the Report of the British delegates. The Report will be published in due course. As regards the method of giving effect in this country to any alteration of the Convention, I must refer my hon. friend to the reply given to-day to the hon. Member for North Salford.

Pay of the First Sea Lord.

MR. DU CROS (Hastings): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, having regard to the fact that the Navy Estimates 1908–9 show on page 160 that the half-pay of admirals of the fleet is £1,222 15s. annually, and that a note is appended stating stating that one of these officers is in receipt of half-pay at the rate of £2,000 a year, an Order in Council was issued to sanction this increase; if so, what is the date of the said Order and what are its precise terms; and, having regard to the sums shown on pages 258 and 148 of the Navy Estimates for 1908–9 as making up the total emoluments of the First Sea Lord to £3,865 a year, what precedent exists for increasing the Navy Estimates by £800 in the half-pay of the First Sea Lord; and whether that increase is to be retro-active and permanent in the case of Admirals of the Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative, the Order in Council is dated 8th January, 1906. Its terms authorise the Admiralty, in the event of the office of First Sea Lord being held by an Admiral of the Fleet who has rendered exceptional and special service, to grant, subject to the concurrence of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, naval half-pay at the rate of £2,000 a year, instead of at the ordinary rate of the £1,222 15s., this special rate of half-pay to be continued on the officer in question ceasing to be a member of the Board of Admiralty, and after his retirement from the active list of His Majesty's Navy. The reply to the last part of the Question is in the negative, the authority given by the Order in Council being permissive.

Drainage from Carnadoe Co-operative Creamery.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Board of Works have interfered to prevent the Carnadoe Co-operative Creamery from draining their establishment into a drain forming the boundary between their premises and the lands of Mr. John Kelly, and, if so, upon what grounds; and whether any objection has been raised to the proposed drainage by Mr. Kelly or the Board of Works tenants in the vicinity.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I am informed that the Board of Works as Shannon Commissioners have declined to allow the outflow from this creamery to be drained into Carnadoe Water, which flows into the Shannon. The outflow from creameries has a very strong and offensive odour; and in a previous case where such outflow was allowed to run into a tributary of the Shannon it rendered the water unfit for domestic use.

Evicted Tenants—Application from Samuel Keys.

MR. C. MACVEIGH (Donegal, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Samuel Keys to be reinstated in his farm at Tammakeerey, County Tyrone, on the estate of the Duke of Abercorn, from which he was evicted four years ago for non-payment of rent; whether he is aware that the planter, Miss Crumley, now in occupation of the farm is willing to give it up if paid compensation; and whether he will direct the Estates Commissioners to send down an inspector to inquire into Keys' case and have him reinstated or compensated for the loss of his farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the application in question was received after the date specified in the Evicted Tenants Act, and cannot be dealt with under that Act. The Commissioners are not aware that the present occupier of the farm is willing to surrender it on receiving compensation. The application will be considered if and when the lands are being dealt with under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Inspection of Untenanted Land on the Caldbeck Estate.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners will inform the hon. Member for Ossory when their inspector, Mr. Boothe, will again visit Ballacolla, Queen's County, on official duty in connection with the untenanted land on the Caldbeck estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are not in a position at present to say when their inspector may visit the property.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Speed of the New Destroyers.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is to be the contract speed of the sixteen destroyers of this year's programme.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): Twenty-seven knots.

MR. BELLAIRS: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us why the change has been made from thirty-three knots to twenty-seven knots?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir, not in answer to a Question.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it has been stated to Parliament that a speed of thirty-three knots was to be secured, and that no correction of that has been published?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not think it has been definitely stated in that form.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): Has it not been frequently stated that that speed would be maintained in future vessels?

MR. MCKENNA: I am not aware of any statement being made that the destroyers would necessarily have a speed of thirty-three knots.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in another place on the 18th March, Lord Tweedmouth definitely stated that thirty-three knots would be the speed? That is reported in *Hansard* in a starred speech.

MR. MCKENNA: I believe some statement was made in another place, but I do not understand that the Admiralty committed itself to the view that the destroyers this year would necessarily have a speed of thirty-three knots.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: May I ask whether Lord Tweedmouth, the First Lord of the Admiralty, speaking in another place on behalf of the Government, did not definitely state that it would be a speed of thirty-three knots, and was not the House of Commons justified in accepting that as a statement made on behalf of the Admiralty?

MR. MCKENNA: My impression is that it was not a definite statement.

MR. BELLAIRS: Did he not state that the speed would be thirty-three knots?

*MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members must give notice of these Questions; it is not fair to press them in this way.

Defence of Esquimault.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state on what terms the fortress, defence works, and docks of Esquimault were handed over to the Government of the Dominion of Canada; whether the Dominion Government agreed to maintain the armament and defences in a proper and efficient manner; and, if so, what steps the Admiralty have taken to satisfy themselves that this is being done.

MR. MCKENNA: It has been found that the transfer referred to by the noble Lord can only be effected by Act of Parliament, and the terms will be embodied in a Bill which it is hoped will be presented early next session.

EARL WINTERTON: Are we to understand that during the past two years the fortress has not been maintained by England?

MR. MCKENNA: It has been maintained by the Government of the Dominion of Canada. The transfer has not been made because we have been advised it can only be effected by Act of Parliament, and terms of the transfer will be embodied in the Bill.

EARL WINTERTON pressed for an Answer to the latter part of the Question, as to the terms on which the Dominion of Canada had taken the fortress over.

MR. MCKENNA: The terms will be embodied in the Bill, and the proper time for a statement will be on the introduction of the Bill.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is it not the case that the Government of the Dominion has spent a larger sum on these defences in the last two years than was spent in the previous ten years?

MR. MCKENNA: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Rosyth.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will ascertain from the contractors what is the earliest date by which they would undertake to complete the various contracts at Rosyth, provided they were permitted to set to work at once and to use the utmost diligence; and what extra expenditure, if any, would be involved by such acceleration of the work.

MR. MCKENNA: After full consideration of the best method of expediting the completion of the work, we came to the conclusion that the best course was to fix a reasonable time for the contract, and to offer a substantial bonus for earlier completion; and tenders have been invited on this basis. Work cannot be commenced until all tenders have been received and duly considered.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the portion of my Question in which I ask if he will ask the contractors what is the earliest date by which they would undertake to complete the various works, under the circumstances set forth in the Question.

MR. MCKENNA: There are no contractors. Tenders have been invited, but have not yet been received.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Of course there are no contractors; perhaps I have been misunderstood. Will you ask the contractors when they send in their tenders the Question I have put on the Paper?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir; the Admiralty conceives that the best course would be to fix the time for the completion and then to offer the contractors a substantial bonus for hastening the work.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether between the date when the construction of a naval base at Rosyth was first accepted in principle and the present time, the imperial dockyard and Messrs. Krupp's shipbuilding works at Kiel have been completed, and the important works at Wilhelmshaven commenced and completed.

MR. MCKENNA: The works now owned by Messrs. Krupp and Kiel dockyard have been in existence for many years past—since 1865 and 1878 respectively. Wilhelmshaven dockyard was begun in 1901, and it is understood that it is not yet completed.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that he is entirely misinformed upon both these points? Is it not a fact that these works were already commenced in 1902–03 and have been finished quite recently? I saw them myself; I am speaking of the great Krupp dockyard at Kiel and the new Government dockyard there.

MR. MCKENNA: I think the information supplied to me which I have given in my answer is quite correct.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER rose to put a further Question——

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has given the best information he can and he cannot do more than that.

London and Admiralty Contracts.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): On behalf of the hon. Member for Deptford, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in the placing of work in connection with the year's shipbuilding programme, he will consider the advisability of so allocating the contracts as to ensure that they shall be spread over as large an area as possible, thereby ensuring that the port of London, in common with other shipbuilding centres, may receive a share of such work and the stress of unemployment be reduced in as many districts as possible.

MR. McKENNA: I cannot undertake that any particular district shall have a contract for shipbuilding allotted to it. In the allocation of these contracts, regard must be had to considerations of price and comparative excellence of work. Subject to this understanding, the contracts will be spread over as large an area as possible.

MR. STEADMAN: Do not the whole of the taxpayers of the country have to contribute towards both shipbuilding and repairing, and that being so, have we any right to shut out the thousands of starving men in the East End of London because their labour and material cost more than in the North ?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter for argument.

British and Foreign Naval Estimates.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state the total aggregate amounts voted during the last ten years, 1897 to 1907, for the Naval Estimates of France, Russia, Germany, and the United Kingdom, respectively.

MR. McKENNA: I think my hon. friend will find all the information he requires in the Return, of which I have sent him a copy, moved for by my hon. friend the Member for Leicester.

MR. MACKARNESS: But in view of the great public interest in naval expenditure outside this House cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the figures in the form of an Answer to a Question ?

MR. McKENNA: It would be difficult to read them out.

MR. BELLAIRS: And when they are circulated will the right hon. Gentleman also circulate the appendix showing the large deductions made from the British figures and which are not included in the Russian and German estimates ?

MR. McKENNA: I will consider that point.

The New Destroyers.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the sixteen new destroyers now building or about to be built for the Navy will only have a speed of twenty-seven knots; and whether coal is to be used instead of oil.

MR. McKENNA: Yes, Sir.

MR. HUNT: Why are not the destroyers being built for a higher speed ?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that Question.

Dockyard Pay Concession.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, with a view to securing the earliest practicable financial benefit to the additional men to be employed this winter in the royal dockyards, he will consider the advisability of exempting these men from the ordinary rule whereby a week's wages is kept in hand by the cashier and paid on the termination of the period of employment; and whether special arrangements can be made to pay such men at least 75 per cent. of the wages earned during the first week of their employment.

MR. McKENNA: In making arrangements for the entry of the men in question, full consideration was given to the fact that many of them might be in straightened circumstances. With the object therefore of relieving such distress at the earliest possible moment, special arrangements have been made to waive, in their case, the ordinary dockyard rule requiring a week's wages to be kept in hand, and instructions given that these men were to be paid 75 per cent. of the amount earned during the first week of their employment.

The Australian Squadron.

EARL WINTERTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the strong opinion recently expressed by the late Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr. Deakin, by the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and by representative men throughout Australasia in favour of the strengthening of the Australian squadron, and also having regard to to the alleged need for impressing the inhabitants of the various Pacific Islands with the greatness of English sea-power, he will consider the advisability of either permanently strengthening the present Australian squadron or else sending a strong fleet to visit Australian waters next year.

MR. McKENNA: It is not known to what recent expression of opinion the noble Lord refers, but the attitude of Mr. Deakin and Sir J. Ward was clearly explained at the time of the Colonial Conference last year, and Mr. Deakin's statements at the time were applicable more to the establishment of a local naval defence force than to an increase in the strength of the Australian squadron. There is no intention to send a large fleet to visit Australian waters next year, though it is probable that some of His Majesty's ships may be detailed to visit the Pacific Islands.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is it not a fact that the Commonwealth Government has formulated plans for the establishment of a local Navy, and have those plans met generally with the approval of the Admiralty at home?

MR. McKENNA: If the hon. Member refers to Mr. Deakin's scheme, I have already stated in the House that the Admiralty have advised on that scheme, and have done their best to turn it into a practical working arrangement.

Naval Standards.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister, having regard to the declaration of the Government that the naval strength of this country must be maintained at 10 per cent. above the combined strength of the next two strongest Powers, will he consider the wisdom, while still retaining that relative position, of making overtures to other naval Powers with a view to the reciprocal and proportionate reduction of the competitive expenditure on naval defence which is imposing such burdens on the taxpayers of this and other countries.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The other naval Powers are well aware of the views which His Majesty's Government have more than once expressed as to the unnecessary burdens which are imposed on taxpayers by competitive expenditure in shipbuilding.

MR. BYLES: Is it not in the knowledge of my right hon. friend that a former Foreign Secretary, Lord Clarendon, with the full concurrence of the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, did actually make overtures in this direction, and received substantial encouragement from some of the European Powers?

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot for the moment charge my memory with that historical fact, but His Majesty's Government have not been wanting.

*MR. MACKARNESS: Does the declaration of the right hon. gentleman regarding the two next strongest Powers include a Power bound actually to us by a treaty of alliance, such as Japan?

MR. ASQUITH: That does not arise out of the Question.

Capital Ships.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that in order to maintain in His Majesty's Navy a preponderance of 10 per cent. over the combined strength in capital ships of the two next strongest Powers it is necessary that the construction of further capital ships should be entered upon without delay, he will state if it is the intention of the Government to lay down any capital ships beyond those already sanctioned before the conclusion of the present financial year.

MR. ASQUITH: In the opinion of the Admiralty no such necessity exists as the hon. Member suggests, and the Government have no intention of altering the programme already sanctioned for the current financial year.

War Office Purchases Abroad.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the total amount involved in the contracts for general stores and other manufactured articles secured by foreign firms during the last two years; and if he will classify the goods in question and state what sum has been saved to the Exchequer by making those purchases abroad instead of in this country.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The figures are too long to read out to the House, but I will have them printed with the Votes and Proceedings. I may point out that those for 1906–7 will be found in House of Commons Paper 327 of 1907. As regards the last part of the Question, it is not possible to state what the expenditure on the various items would have been if they had been obtained in some other way, most of them being foreign products or specialities.

The Curragh—Officers' Quarters.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what arrangements are being made to provide proper accommodation during the winter for the officers of the Army Service Corps at the Curragh.

MR. HALDANE: The Officers of the Army Service Corps are at present accommodated in huts at the Curragh, which are to be replaced by new buildings. As already stated, plans for these have been approved and the building will be proceeded with as soon as possible. Meanwhile the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Ireland, will take such steps as are necessary to ensure accommodation for these officers during the winter, in huts or in quarters, as is most suitable. Provision is made for the extra issue of fuel in Ireland, in unusually damp or cold weather.

Carlow Barracks.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the barracks at Carlow, to which the 144th Battery Royal Field Artillery have been moved from Ballinrobe, are in a proper state of repair; and whether it is intended to keep this battery there during the winter.

MR. HALDANE: The reply to both Questions is in the affirmative.

MR. ASHLEY: Was it not stated in the Army List last week that the battery was only temporarily stationed at Ballinrobe? My information is that the barracks are in a very unsatisfactory state. Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further?

MR. HALDANE: I have done so, and I have received a far more favourable account than the hon. Member appears to have done.

One-Room Married Quarters.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many one-room married quarters are at present in occupation in the barracks of the United Kingdom.

MR. HALDANE: The total number of single-room married soldiers' quarters which are at present available for occupation is 1,406—a number which I very much regret. Of this a considerable number are occupied by families who have more than one quarter allotted to them.

The Irish Command.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is his intention to quarter a cavalry regiment in the 6th Division of the Irish command, in view of the fact that the command consists of two infantry brigades and divisional troops comprising three brigades of field artillery.

MR. HALDANE: A cavalry regiment does not form part of a division in war, and there is no intention of allotting one to this or to any other division in peace.

MR. ASHLEY was understood to ask if it was not usual to have a cavalry regiment with a division.

MR. HALDANE: A cavalry regiment does not form part of a division.

Beresford Barracks, Curragh.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Beresford Barracks at the Curragh are correctly described in the Army Medical Department Report for the year 1907, which has been presented to Parliament, as rapidly decaying and getting beyond repair, the rooms being draughty, cheerless, and very cold in winter.

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing to add to the reply which I have already given to the hon. Member on this subject. The Quartermaster-General does not consider that the barracks are in so bad a condition as suggested in the Question.

MR. ASHLEY: Then will the right hon. Gentleman have the Report of 1907 corrected?

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): Are these old Crimean huts—rotten old things?

MR. HALDANE: We are removing them as fast as we can.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: But are they still actually occupied?

MR. HALDANE: They have been very much changed since the Crimean War.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Would not places like this be declared by civil authorities to be unfit for human habitation?

[No Answer was returned.]

War Office and Small Holdings.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that at an inquiry recently held at Durrington, by the Wiltshire Small Holdings Committee, to consider applications for land from persons resident in Bulford, Durrington, Figheldean, and Netheravon, all parishes situate on the War Office estate, the amount of land offered by the War Office for this purpose was 120 acres, whereas the acreage applied for was 1,500, thirty acres out of the 120 moreover being unsuitable and unreasonably rented; and whether, seeing that the War Office is the sole owner of land in these parishes, he will cause a larger supply of more suitable land to be placed at the disposal of the landholding associations formed there under the Act of 1907 to assist suitable applicants to obtain small holdings.

MR. HALDANE: After a conference with the Wiltshire County Council in the early part of the year at which the whole question was very fully discussed, it was decided that the 140 acres in question (not 120 as stated) were the only land which, consistently with military requirements, could be spared for small holdings. The War Department gave instructions that the rent should not be in excess of a fair agricultural rent and is willing to consider any representations on the particular case mentioned.

MR. ROGERS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would realise that, as the War Office owned all the land in the valley, any grant of land for small holdings must come from them.

MR. HALDANE: That is very well, but I absolutely must have land for manœuvres, and you can no more have small holdings in the middle of a military area than you can have them in the middle of London.

MR. ROGERS: But is it not the fact that there is a good deal of unlet land which would be suitable for small holdings?

MR. HALDANE said the matter had been gone into with the utmost desire to find as much land as possible for small holdings. It had been gone into not only by generals, but by people who were as keen about small holdings as his hon. friend.

Sedition in India—Kanai's Funeral.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if the body of the murderer Kanai, who was hanged in Alipur gaol on the 10th instant, was allowed to be carried in a procession to the funeral pyre where it was burned with honour, and a funeral oration delivered amidst shouts of victory to Kanai; and, if so, if the Government will arrange that the bodies of those executed should be buried or burned within the precincts of the gaol as in England.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The body of Kanai Lal Dutt was made over to the relatives in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the Bengal gaol code, but it was stipulated that the body must be cremated at the nearest burning ghat with no public demonstration. This stipulation was not observed, but the accounts of what occurred appear to be much exaggerated, and there was no funeral oration delivered. The gaol code has been amended, and in future, bodies of executed criminals will not be delivered to their relatives if there is reason to apprehend demonstrations at the funeral.

Mr. FELL: Do the new regulations apply to the whole of India, or only to Bengal?

Mr. BUCHANAN: There are different gaol codes for the different provinces of India, but this emendation will apply to them all.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Will it meet with public approval in India?

Mr. BUCHANAN: It is already in operation in Bombay.

Punjab Judgeship.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a vacancy recently occurred in the Punjab chief Court, owing to the retiral of an Indian native Judge who had occupied the position for fifteen years; that the vacancy has been filled by a European member of the Civil Service; that in the appointment of a temporary additional Judge at the same Court the native leader of the bar, who had formerly held a temporary judgeship and is believed to have been again recommended by the chief Judge of the civil Court, was passed over; and whether he can explain on what grounds these appointments are made.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I understand that the place of the Indian Judge, who has retired from the bench of the Punjab chief Court has been filled by the confirmation of a civilian Judge who has been officiating in the Court for three years past. But an additional appointment of a Judge in the Court which has recently been sanctioned has been conferred upon an Indian gentleman who is a barrister. These appointments are made by the Government of India, not by the Secretary of State.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE: But why not give the vacant post to a native?

Mr. BUCHANAN: It was a case of promotion all along the line.

Indian Army Pensions.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the proposals made last year by the Government of India to the effect that the previous commissioned service, out of India, of officers of the Indian Army up to a period of five years should be allowed to reckon as service towards Indian pension have been sanctioned.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The proposal of the Government of India has been referred to the War Office, because it involves a charge on British revenues, as indicated in the Secretary of State's Answer to the hon. Member's Question of 2nd April last. The reply of the Army Council has not yet been received. The Secretary of State has, however, separately sanctioned certain concessions, including a new pension for thirty years service, with the object of relieving the hardship entailed on certain officers of the Indian Army by the rule which limits non-Indian service counting for pension to two years.

Mr. SMEATON: May we hope for an early settlement of the question?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I hope to soon get a reply from the Army Council.

Transvaal Civil Service.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give the number of Civil servants of British birth in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies who, while being retained in the employment of the Colonial Governments, have had their status or rank reduced since the grant of self-government to these Colonies, in order that other persons of Boer or Hollander birth, having a less period of service and experience, should be promoted over them.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): I must refer the hon. Member to Cd. 4,353, and to my reply to the hon. Member for Gravesend on the 12th instant.

MR. CARLILE: Did these retrenched officials have their salaries reduced?

COLONEL SEELY: Full information is given in the Cd. paper.

Education of Indian Children in Natal.

SIR C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the reduction of the educational facilities hitherto afforded Indian children born in Natal; whether the new regulations will have the effect of summarily dismissing pupils over the age of fourteen who have been attending the higher-grade Indian schools; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has no information as to the regulations mentioned by my hon. friend, but inquiry is being made as to them, and as to any reduction of educational facilities afforded to Indians born in Natal. The amount provided for Indian education on the Estimates for this year is approximately the same as in previous years.

White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if it is proposed to circulate the Minute of the 30th September last of the Transvaal Government relating to work on the mines formerly done by Chinese now being performed by white labour.

COLONEL SEELY: Yes, Sir; it will be included in the next general Blue-book.

Stalls in Station Road, Forest Gate.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department by what authority the police have taken proceedings against several tradesmen in Station Road, Forest Gate, for placing stalls outside their premises, they having first obtained the quiescent approval of the West Ham Borough Council; and, as the road is suited for stalls and they would be a great advantage to the surrounding neighbourhood, will he give instructions for the summons, which is returnable for the 17th, to be withdrawn.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Seven persons have been summoned under the Highways Act for obstructing this narrow roadway with their stalls, two of them being tradesmen, and the remaining five costermongers from a distance. I am informed by the Commissioner of Police that stalls cannot stand in the Station Road without causing obstruction and annoyance; and it is not the case that the West Ham Borough Council have given any approval. The proceedings have been adjourned for a fortnight, in order that counsel may be instructed for the defence.

The Aliens Act.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary for the Home Department whether, in view of the poverty caused by the increasing want of employment, he could see his way to making more strict the administration of the Aliens Act.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am afraid the hon. Member's suggestion does not offer any effective remedy for the evils of unemployment in this country.

MR. HUNT: Is it not the fact that the importation of these aliens deprives our people of work and makes their conditions of life much harder?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter for argument.

Factory Inspectorships.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many of the sixteen new inspectorships for factories, promised in May, have now been appointed; and how many of these are promotions from the ranks of assistants.

MR. GLADSTONE: Since the announcement which I made on the 27th February last in answer to a Question by my hon. friend the Member for Berwickshire, eight additional inspectors have been appointed, besides four to fill vacancies which have arisen. Of these twelve appointments, two were promotions from the Assistant class. The eight remaining posts will be filled in the course of this winter.

New Home Rule Campaign—Visit of Irish Americans.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that Patrick Ford, who was declared by three of His Majesty's Judges to be a known advocate of crime and the use of dynamite, and O'Meagher Condon, who was sentenced to death for the murder of an English policeman, intend visiting this country; whether their licences permit them to do so; and, if not, what action the Executive propose to take in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to answer this question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I am not aware of the intentions of these persons. Neither of them is the holder of a licence.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a public invitation has been given by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford to these persons to come over to this country to preach Home Rule, and will they be allowed to land?

MR. GLADSTONE'S reply was inaudible.

EARL WINTERTON: May I ask whether these two men are not well-known criminals?

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I rise to a point of order. One of the persons mentioned in this Question is an official of the United States Government and is it to be permitted that an epithet such as that is to be applied to a high official in the service of the United States and one who has been so for twenty years?

*MR. SPEAKER: There are two statements with reference to these gentlemen in this Question, and I did not understand that they are contradicted.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Certainly they are contradicted.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not understand that they were.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Most undoubtedly.

*MR. SPEAKER: If it is not true that one of these gentlemen was declared by His Majesty's Judges to have been an advocate of crime and that one was sentenced to death, of course these statements ought not to have appeared on the Paper.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Arising out of that I hold myself responsible for what has appeared in this Question, and I shall be very glad to give the hon. and learned Member sufficient proof to satisfy him that the facts are as stated.

MR. GLADSTONE: Perhaps I had better, under the circumstances, say that Mr. Ford, so far as I know, has not been convicted of a criminal offence in this country, and as regards Mr. O'Meagher Condon, he received a pardon under the Great Seal as far back as 1878.

International Copyright Conference.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what, if any, amendments to the British copyright law are being proposed to the International Conference now sitting at Berne; and will any amendments which may be agreed to by the British delegates be submitted for discussion to the House of Commons, or will the Government make use of an Order in Council for their ratification.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): Some of the proposed amendments to the Berne Convention would involve an alteration of British law and could not of course be adopted by His Majesty's Government until the necessary legislation had been passed. An Order in Council under the International Copyright Acts can only give foreign works the benefit of the existing law and cannot alter that law.

MR. BYLES: Do I understand that some of these provisions will have to be the subject of legislation?

writ has not been moved for on behalf of the chief.

COLONEL SEELY: The writ of *habeas corpus* does not exist, I understand, in Natal, but there is an analogous procedure. For such a procedure to be successful it would be necessary to show that the authority under which the prisoner is detained is illegal and as far as the Secretary of State is aware, it is, and always has been, open to the prisoner, if his legal advisers consider this to be in his interests, to take steps to test its legality. I presume that they do not advise such steps.

Dinizulu's Trial—Constitution of Special Court.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state who will be the members of the special court appointed to try Dinizulu; and by what law and rules of evidence the court will be bound at the trial.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir, I regret that I am not yet in a position to say who the members of the Court will be, but full information with regard to the composition of the Court will be found in the Papers which are now being distributed. I have telegraphed to the Natal Government to send the names in view of to-morrow's debate.

MR. MACKARNESS: Will the ordinary law of Natal obtain at the trial?

COLONEL SEELY: The answer to that will be found in the text of the Special Court Bill.

Alleged Flogging of Witnesses.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that Miss Colenso, in reply to a statement of Lieutenant-Colonel Green, Minister of Railways in the Natal Government, denying the flogging of natives in respect to the procuring of evidence against Dinizulu, has given twenty-nine cases of flogging, including some cases of the flogging of women, in addition to those officially admitted; and whether those cases of flogging will come within the purview of the proposed Indemnity Act, and their perpetrators become immune from punishment.

COLONEL SEELY: I am aware that allegations of flogging have lately been made and denied. With regard to Miss Colenso's assertion I notice that according to a Press telegram the Prime Minister of Natal on the 23rd instant stated that the Government had inquired into all the alleged cases of assault during the military operations in the northern districts and promised further investigation upon a formal complaint being made and some proof offered in support of Miss Colenso's allegations. My hon. friend will find information regarding the Indemnity Bill in the Papers which are being distributed to-day.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is it more favourable to the illegal action of the Natal Government——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must not refer to a friendly Colonial Government in that way.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I did not refer to it in the way you thought, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member assumes that a thing is illegal. That remains to be proved.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With great respect, Sir, everything done under martial law is *prima facie* illegal.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not the business of the hon. Member to lecture me on the subject of martial law.

Martial Law in Natal—Indemnity Bill.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, having regard to the sensation produced in this country by the method of administration of martial law in Natal, and the grave character of the charges advanced against officials in respect to their conduct towards the natives in carrying out the martial law system, the opinion of the House of Commons will be ascertained before the assent of the Crown is given to any Indemnity Bill passed by the Natal Legislature, and that such assent be not given when the Imperial Parliament is

It is only in this way that the earnings of the wife would have to be considered at all.

Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee.

Mr. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether an application, dated 20th August, 1908, asking for a grant from the fund provided by Parliament for the relief of distress, has been received from the clerk of the Barrow-in-Furness distress committee; whether a further letter, dated 9th November, has been received urging attention to this matter; whether he is aware that the mayor estimates that one-seventh of the whole population of 70,000 are dependent on charity for their very existence; whether any decision has yet been arrived at; and, if not, whether, in view of the serious nature of the present distress, a speedy and favourable decision may be anticipated.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have been in communication with the Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee on this subject, and have already made a payment of £500 from the grant in respect of certain work in the public park. I am now sending a further sum of £500 in respect of the wages of the unemployed engaged on a road improvement which is being carried out by the town council.

Afforestation Schemes.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what other schemes of afforestation by the unemployed have been begun besides the Leeds scheme; whether they have been successful; and what reports as to the condition of the trees so planted have reached the Board.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: The Leeds scheme is the only scheme of afforestation which has been carried out under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.

Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief.

Mr. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can now state whether an applicant for an old-age pension will be disqualified for his pension owing to having received relief from the guardians, when such relief has been repaid in full to them on his behalf.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have submitted a case on this subject to the Law Officers of the Crown, and I hope to receive their opinion in the course of a few days.

Imported Meat.

Mr. HUNT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has seen the present regulations of the United States and of South America for preventing the importation of tuberculous meat into this country; whether he will have them issued to Members; and what means he has of knowing that they are carried out efficiently.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I have seen the regulations concerning meat inspection which are now in force in the United States and which have been prescribed for the purpose of preventing the use in foreign commerce of meat and meat food-products which are unfit for human food. Immediately after the passing of the Act of Congress under which these regulations were made, the staff employed in the Federal Meat Inspection Service was considerably increased, and it appears that on 1st July, 1907, 2,290 persons were employed on this service as compared with 981 persons so employed on 1st July, 1906. I am not aware that it is necessary to lay the regulations on the Table, but I will show the hon. Member a circular issued by the United States Bureau of Animal Industry containing a description of the Federal Meat Inspection Service, if he so desires. As regards South America, the country principally concerned is Argentina. By a decree made in October, 1906, Argentina meat products are required to be submitted to a technical inspection before exportation, and the Cattle Department are empowered to make detailed regulations. I have not seen these regulations, or any statement as regards the inspecting staff. I am endeavouring to obtain information on the subject through the Foreign Office.

MR. HUNT: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question?

MR. JOHN BURNS: That ought not to affect the position of our inspectors with regard to foreign meat which may have been inspected prior to its despatch and which, prior to its arrival in England, may have deteriorated and become unfit for food.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Have the new regulations of the Local Government Board dealing with the importation of American meat been laid on the Table of the House?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes, and they will come into operation on 1st January.

Postmen in E.C. District.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that for the past six years forty-seven unestablished officers have been employed at the Eastern Central district office on regular and responsible delivery duties; whether he is aware that most of these men are in full outside employment; and whether, having in view the state of unemployment throughout the country, he can see his way clear to increase the established staff by means of the duties referred to.

THE POSTMASTER - GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The unestablished officers in question are auxiliary postmen who attend for half a day's work daily in order to assist with the last delivery. I am afraid they cannot be replaced by established full-time postmen; to do so would involve considerable waste of force.

Overtime at the General Post Office.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): On behalf of the hon. Member for Deptford I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the amount of systematic overtime that the sorters and letter-carriers at the General Post Office (E.C.) are called upon to work; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirability of creating a sufficient number of new established posts in order to reduce such overtime work to a minimum.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: This is a matter which receives constant attention. Unfortunately a certain amount of overtime has to be performed by sorters and postmen, due to the intermittent character of extra work arising from foreign and Colonial mail arrivals, heavy postings, etc. Every opportunity is taken to reduce overtime by the employment of additional established officers; and considerable improvements of this nature were made quite recently in the E.C. district.

Medical Aid for M.P.'s.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is yet in a position to state what arrangements he has been able to make with a view to secure that the necessary medical and surgical appliances are available, and a medical doctor to apply them, in case of sudden illness occurring within the premises of the House.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): A large medicine chest, replete with every drug and instrument which the ingenuity or necessities of man can require, has been generously presented to the House by a well-known firm of manufacturing chemists, who do not desire their name to be mentioned in the matter; but I am glad to take this opportunity of conveying to the anonymous donors the gratitude of those who may subsequently profit by these appliances. The contents of this chest were decided upon after the careful consideration and advice of specialists in these matters. There are four keys to it which are held by the Inspector of Police in the Lords and Commons, the Serjeant-at-Arms, and a representative of the Office of Works. I have no doubt that, if and when the necessity should arise, Members will receive in the future, as they have done in the past, the immediate and careful attention of their medical colleagues in this House.

The Galleries of the House.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether arrangements can be made, in view of the vacant space now in the Strangers' Gallery, to give more room for the representatives of the home and foreign Press to report the proceedings of the House.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: I have no power to admit any persons to the Galleries from which strangers are now excluded by Mr. Speaker's orders. If I had suddenly become the fountain of orders I should not feel myself safe even within the precincts of this House.

The Serpentine.

Mr. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether, owing to the amount of unemployment in London, he could arrange to have the cleansing of the Serpentine taken in hand with as little delay as possible.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: I regret that this is a suggestion which I am unable to adopt, but I am arranging to clean part of the lake in the Regent's Park.

Mr. B. S. STRAUS: Is there no possibility of cleaning the Serpentine before the spring so that bathing may safely take place then?

Mr. L. HARCOURT: I do not think bathers will be in any danger.

Voluntary School Managers and Motor Warning Signs.

Earl WINTERTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his Department have issued any order or memorandum prohibiting county education committees from issuing motor warning signs to voluntary school managers.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): No, Sir.

Control of the Feeble-minded.

Sir JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what sum of money has been expended by the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded in procuring evidence, on the travelling expenses of members of the Commission, and in the preparation and printing of the evidence and Report.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): It is not possible to state separately the amount expended by the Royal Commission for the purpose of procuring evidence. The expenditure included: Travelling expenses of members of the Commission, £3,025; sums paid to witnesses, £540; printing evidence and Report, £4,943; general expenses of the inquiry, mainly for obtaining and preparing evidence and materials for the Report, £11,159; making a total of, £19,667, which does not include the cost of accommodation.

Parliament and the Fair Wage Resolution.

Mr. STEADMAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Deptford, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Inter-departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the manner in which the Fair Wage Resolution of the House is being observed has drafted its Report: and, if so, can he state when such Report will be issued and circulated to Members of the House.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am informed that the Report will be signed in the course of two or three days. I cannot say when it will be presented to Parliament.

Scottish School Grants.

Mr. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland what sum on the average will be received by the local authorities in Peeblesshire, Perthshire, Forfarshire, Dumfriesshire, and Lanarkshire, respectively, for each pupil in average attendance in board schools and other State-aided schools under his second scheme of allocation of the balance of £436,500; and what sum would they each receive on the average if this balance were equally divided amongst the authorities with sole regard to the pupils in average attendance.

I beg also to ask the Secretary for Scotland, what total sum would be received by the combined local education authorities of Lanarkshire, providing they received the same sum for each pupil in average attendance as will be received respectively by the authorities in Peeblesshire, Perthshire, Forfarshire, and Dumfriesshire, respectively, under his second allocation of the balance of £436,500.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): In answer to these Questions, I have to point out that the information desired not only as regards the district he mentions but as regards any other district may be obtained by dividing the sum allocated to any particular district, as shown in the Return ordered to be printed 3rd June, 1908, by the average attendance at schools in that district as shown on page 134 of the Department's Return, Cd. 4003.

*MR. MENZIES: Why should the county of Peebles have a grant of 20s. 9d. for each pupil in average attendance, and the neighbouring and poorer county of Lanarkshire only receive 9s. 7d.?

MR. SINCLAIR: The Answer is somewhat complicated, and could not be given in reply to a Question across the floor. It is rather a matter for discussion.

*MR. MENZIES: Is it fair that a large and rich county like Perthshire should get 8s. more per pupil than a poor one?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

Scottish Paupers.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will give the number of persons over sixty-five years of age in receipt of Poor Law relief in Scotland; and whether he will give the estimated number of such persons who are over seventy years of age.

MR. SINCLAIR: The number of persons (exclusive of lunatics) over sixty-five years of age in receipt of Poor Law relief in Scotland at 15th May, 1908, was 24,429; I hope to be in a position a little later to give the number of such persons who are over seventy years of age.

Black Scab in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is now in a position to give an undertaking that in the case of every outbreak of black scab potato disease reported in Ireland all diseased tubers will be destroyed at once and that the growers will receive compensation from funds provided by the Treasury.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Department have already destroyed all potatoes discovered affected with black scab and they will continue to do so. It does not appear to be necessary to raise the question of compensation, there having been no further outbreak of the disease beyond the two cases dealt with.

County Mayo Evicted Tenants.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the Report of the Estates Commissioners that of 513 applications from evicted tenants in the county of Mayo only eleven applicants have been reinstated or provided with holdings, and 337 were refused after inquiry, what was the nature of the inquiry referred to; were the applicants given an opportunity of being heard by the Commissioners or were they apprised of the reasons for which their applications were rejected; and whether, in view of this almost complete breakdown of the Evicted Tenants Acts in the county where harsh evictions have been most frequent, some steps will be taken to re open these cases, either by altering the regulations issued to the Estates Commissioners or by giving the applicants an appeal to the County Court Judge.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I would refer the hon. Member to the Special Report on Evicted Tenants prepared by the Estates Commissioners, and presented to Parliament in 1907 [Cd. Paper 3570], for a full statement of the practice adopted by the Commissioners and the principles on which they act in dealing with applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as evicted tenants. Before rejecting a case the Commissioners make local inquiries through their inspector, who interviews the applicant if it is practicable to do so. It is not the practice of the Commissioners to state the reasons which actuate them in the exercise of their discretion. They are acquiring untenanted land to provide holdings for evicted tenants who have been considered suitable. No further regulations on the subject appear to be necessary.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN asked how many cases in which inspectors made strong recommendations were rejected without appeal. Would the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of giving them a re-hearing?

Mr. BIRRELL promised to inquire as to the number.

Irish Land Purchase Acts.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of tenant farmers in Ireland who have purchased or agreed to purchase under all the Purchase Acts from 1870 up to the present date.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the Land Commission that the number of purchasers to whom advances had been made under the various Land Purchase Acts from 1870 up to 30th October last was 143,545; the number who had agreed to purchase but to whom advances had not been made was 149,501; making a total of 293,046 who had either purchased or agreed to purchase up to that date.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: How many bought under the Purchase Acts from 1870 to 1903, and how many since 1903?

Mr. BIRRELL: I cannot give the hon. Member those figures. The purchase money under all the Acts up to 1903 amounted to something like £21,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Are we then to understand that during five years under the Act of 1903 a considerably greater number bought than under all the previous Acts?

Mr. BIRRELL: Yes, undoubtedly.

Land Transfer and Fishery Rights in Ireland.

Mr. GWYNN (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has directed his attention to the case of net fishermen on the Shannon and other rivers whose means of livelihood may be endangered in the process of land transfer, where such transfer effects the ownership of fishery rights; and whether he will consider the advisability of inserting a clause in his amending Land Bill which would authorise the Estates Commissioners to purchase such rights and sell them to the fishermen who have previously leased them, the fishermen paying by instalments like agricultural tenants.

Mr. BIRRELL: It has not been in contemplation to make legislative proposals which would empower advances to be made to fishermen for the purchase of fishery rights under the Land Purchase Acts. It is very doubtful whether fishery rights could be held to afford the same good security for advances which agricultural holdings afford. The question, however, will be fully considered.

Irish Constabulary Bill.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state approximately what is the annual charge contemplated by the proposed Constabulary (Ireland) (Pay, etc.) Resolution standing in his name for Committee stage.

Mr. BIRRELL: The immediate annual increase in the Constabulary Vote would be about £15,000. The Bill, however, contains provisions for raising the pensionable age of the constabulary, and this will ultimately result in a substantial decrease in the cost of the constabulary as a whole, by reducing the charges upon the non-effective list.

MR. MOONEY: How is it that the amount provided for in the Bill is in excess of that recommended by the Howard Vincent Committee?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot answer that without explaining the provisions of the Bill.

Dursey Island.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the purchase agreements between the tenants of Dursey Island and Mr. William Lee White have been lodged; whether the lands have been vested in the tenants; and, if not, what is the cause of delay.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the purchase agreements in this case were lodged in December, 1905. Until the case has been reached in its order of priority, and the advances sanctioned by the Commissioners, the holdings cannot be vested in the tenants.

Castletown Bere Labourers' Cottages.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an inquiry in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts was held at Castletown Bere on 9th April last; whether a scheme for the erection of labourers cottages has been passed; and, if not, can he state what provision is to be made for housing the labourers in the Castletown Bere union.

MR. BIRRELL: An inquiry was held on the date mentioned into the refusal of the Castletown Bere Rural District Council to make a scheme under the Labourers Acts. Nearly all the applicants for cottages and allotments were found to be persons living in the town of Castletown Bere. With one or two exceptions they were not employed in agricultural work, while outside the town there is practically no labouring class as distinguished from occupiers of small holdings. The rural district council have offered to supply cottages without allotments and the Local Government Board have reason to believe that, in the exceptional circumstances of Castletown Bere, this would be considered sufficient by the majority of the applicants. The Board will shortly communicate with the district council on the subject.

MR. GILHOOLY: Is it not necessary that a man should work in agriculture in order to be qualified as an agricultural labourer and get a cottage?

MR. BIRRELL: The object is to provide cottages for agricultural labourers.

MR. GILHOOLY: And if the guardians fail to carry out their duty in this respect, will the Local Government Board send down inspectors?

MR. BIRRELL: They are in communication on the subject.

Doolin Constabulary Charge.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he received a resolution from the Ennistymon Board of Guardians condemning the assault committed on the son of their chairman, Mr. Michael Consedine, county councillor, by the Royal Irish Constabulary, on 18th October, while sitting outside his father's house at Doolin, when forty of the fifty-two members of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Doolin House, which was given to them by Mr. H. V. M'Namara, marched in a body through the public road and batoned every person whom they met; and whether he will have an inquiry made into the conduct of the police, and inform the House who was responsible for this conduct of the police.

MR. BIRRELL: A force of fifty police is stationed at Doolin for the prevention of cattle-driving. On Sunday, 18th October, at about 5.30 in the evening, six of the constables, who were off duty, were returning to their station through the village of Roadford.

They were wheeling their bicycles at the time, and were not possessed of batons. A crowd of men outside a public-house closed in threateningly upon the police, stones were thrown at them, and the two rearmost constables were set upon. One of them was struck on the head with a stone, knocked down, and kicked. Other constables were also assaulted, and their bicycles were jumped upon and smashed with large stones. One of the men escaped to the station, half a mile distant, and Head Constable Gilliland, at once turned out with twelve men and proceeded to the village, where they were reinforced by several other constables. Stones were thrown at this party, and a constable struck. The head constable thereupon ordered his men to draw batons and disperse the crowd, and this was done; the batons being used with, it is admitted, considerable effect. It is quite possible that during the baton charge through the village one or more innocent persons may have suffered. It was dusk at the time, and the police—who belonged to the Reserve—were strangers to the locality. The police authorities have already fully investigated the entire matter, and I am not prepared to give any further inquiry. I regret to say that the constable who was kicked while on the ground, was ruptured, and has had to undergo an operation in hospital.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Whose evidence is the right hon. Gentleman quoting?

MR. BIRRELL: The police.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Seeing that very contradictory accounts are given, and that the police version is strenuously denied by persons of responsibility, will not the right hon. Gentleman direct an inquiry so as to get at the real facts?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no doubt whatever as to the truth of the statement I have given as to the commencement of the affair, and I see no need for an inquiry.

Bodyke Evicted Tenants.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say what arrangements have been made to settle the claims of the evicted tenants on the estate of Colonel O'Callaghan-Westropp, Bodyke, County Clare.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners notified in the *Dublin Gazette* of 6th instant their intention of acquiring compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, certain lands on the estate of Colonel O'Callaghan-Westropp from which tenants were evicted, but the tenants cannot be reinstated until the requirements of the statute have been complied with and the lands acquired.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct the special attention of the Estates Commissioners to the cases of the tenants who have been out of their holdings for a very long time?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

Connaught Winter Assizes.

MR. GWYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can see his way to comply with the request formulated in a recent resolution of the Galway Urban District Council that the Connaught Winter Assizes should be held in Galway instead of in Limerick.

MR. BIRRELL: The Order in Council has already been passed and published in the *Dublin Gazette* directing the Assizes to be held in the City of Limerick. Arrangements have also been definitely made consequent on this Order, and it would be too late now, even if it were expedient, to make any change, as the Assizes will open in the first week in December.

MR. GWYNN asked if arrangements could not be made to hold the Assizes in Galway next year.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) replied that the arrangements were made each year when the proper time arrived.

Wade Estate, Meath.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have purchased the estate of Craven H. C. Wade, county of Meath, including the untenanted land.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have not purchased Mr. Wade's estate, but proceedings for sale have been instituted before them and purchase agreements have been lodged. When dealing with the estate the Commissioners will consider the purchase of the untenanted land.

Colonel Lyster Smythe's Estate.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the former holding of Francis Hopkins, on the estate of Colonel Lyster Smythe, cannot be acquired compulsorily, it being still untenanted land in the occupation of the landlord.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that Hopkins was evicted since the passing of the Act of 1903, and his case does not therefore come within the provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907.

Irish Land Purchase.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the effect of his announcement that the forthcoming Irish Land Bill contemplates a revision of the financial arrangements under the Purchase Act of 1903 as from 1st November last is not to suspend land purchase in Ireland until the Bill specifying the new arrangements becomes law; and has he yet been able to ascertain whether there is any reasonable probability of the Bill being passed into law this year.

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary informs me that since the 1st instant the rate at which purchase agreements have been lodged is still considerably above the normal rate. So far, therefore, there has been no such result as the hon. Member seems to have anticipated. As regards the probability of the Bill becoming law this year, I am afraid that I cannot add anything to my former replies.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly tell us how negotiations are to be carried on for fresh purchases before either landlords or tenants know the new conditions of purchase; and whether or not it is the case that agreements made after 1st November will be subject to the same regulations as if entered into before the new conditions are published?

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend will make a full statement on the subject next Monday, and I will ask the hon. Gentleman to wait till then, when all the points he has raised will be adequately met.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Has any step been taken, such as has been taken on the education question, to see if there is any possibility of bringing about a friendly agreement on the subject?

MR. ASQUITH: I am afraid I cannot answer that.

Irish Constabulary Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange an early day on which to proceed with the Irish Constabulary Bill, in view of the extra strain placed on the force in coping with the increase of agrarian crime in many districts of the South and West.

MR. ASQUITH: Having regard to the recommendations made, so far back as the year 1901, by the Committee presided over by Sir Howard Vincent, and to the undertakings given by the Government in the matter, it is intended to proceed with the financial Resolution in Committee upon the Constabulary (Ireland) Bill at the earliest possible date.

Downpatrick Postal Arrangements.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused by the present arrangements of postal deliveries in Downpatrick, County Down; and whether he could authorise a delivery at about three o'clock in the afternoon, so as to enable business firms to execute on the same day orders contained in that mail; and can he state if the telephone service will be installed in Downpatrick and neighbourhood.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: There are already four deliveries by postmen at Downpatrick, in addition to a delivery to callers at the Post Office at 3 p.m. These arrangements are excepitonally liberal for a town of the size of Downpatrick, and I should not be justified in authorising any further extension. Subject to the approval of the Treasury, I shall be prepared to extend the telephone service to Downpatrick and other places in County Down under guarantee.

Captain CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the complaint is not of the number of deliveries, but of the time at which they take place? Could he not take one off in the morning and put one on at three o'clock.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: If the hon. Member will write me on the subject I shall be glad to consider the matter of broadening the deliveries. I thought the complaint was as to the number.

The Duration of the Session.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, for the convenience of those hon. Members whose homes are at a distance, he can state the date on which the House will rise this session.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am afraid that I cannot make any statement on this matter.

English Education Bill.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Government Amendments to the Education Bill will be placed on the Paper.

Mr. ASQUITH: Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat his Question tomorrow.

Scottish Education Bill.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can state on what day the further consideration on the Report stage of the Scottish Education Bill will be taken.

Mr. ASQUITH: The 24th instant is the earliest possible afternoon which could be given to complete the Education (Scotland) Bill. I cannot, however, fix the date definitely, but I hope on Thursday to make a statement in regard to the business for next week.

Curates and Convocation.

Mr. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether at the forthcoming election of a proctor for the diocese of London to the Canterbury House of Convocation, assistant stipendiary curates will be summoned to vote; whether the King's writ directs the archbishops to summon all the clergy; what the qualification for a vote for a proctor for Convocation is; and, if the omission to summon assistant stipendiary curates is due to any statutory limitation, will he take steps to amend the law so as to ensure that all those who are bound by the canons issued by Convocation shall be represented on that body.

Mr. ASQUITH: As a matter of fact assistant stipendiary curates have not in the past been summoned, and are not now summoned, to vote at the election of proctors for Convocation. The omission to summon assistant stipendiary curates is not due, so far as I am aware, to any statutory limitation, but to the sanction of ancient custom which has been held in questions with regard to the constitution of Convocation to have the force of the law.

Licensing Bill—Sunday Opening.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when he proposes to move the re-committal of the Licensing Bill in order to carry out his undertaking to move the omission of subsection 2 of the new clause (Sale of intoxicating liquor with meals on Sundays, etc.).

MR. ASQUITH: As I said on Friday, there is no intention of re-committing the Bill for this purpose, which can be accomplished elsewhere.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): Will it make any difference to the law whether the subsection is struck out or not?

MR. ASQUITH: Well, I think not.

Duties of Innkeepers.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will introduce a clause into the Licensing Bill stating whether it is, or is not, an indictable offence for a village innkeeper to keep his inn open after closing hours for the provision of non-alcoholic refreshment.

MR. ASQUITH: The law on the subject of the duties of inn-keepers is of old standing and well settled, and does not require any statutory definition.

MR. PIKE PEASE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that his statement and that of the Solicitor-General on Friday have caused great chaos among a great many people in the country? Will a man be allowed to stop after closing hours at night in a public-house in a village if he does not buy anything alcoholic?

MR. ASQUITH: I do not know about chaos. The hon. Gentleman's Question referred to inn-keepers only, and my answer was confined to them.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate the Registration of Nurses," [Nurses Registration Bill [Lords].]

LICENSING BILL.

As amended, further considered.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.) in moving to omit Clause 3, said he would like to remind the Government of what they appeared to forget, that one of the Commandments said, "Thou shalt not steal." By that Commandment it was forbidden to take what belonged to another, and in his opinion the third section of this Bill was an absolute violation of that Commandment. To rob a licensee of the licence for which he had paid in hard cash, to deprive investors in brewery companies of the money they had invested, was an offence against the elementary principles of justice, and all the more odious when it was done in the name, and for the ostensible reason that it was for the well being, of the State and to promote the cause of temperance. The underlying principle of this clause—and this clause was the essence of the Bill—was that the Government of the day might take private property without compensating the individuals from whom they took it, and the doctrine was so pernicious in itself, and it might have such far-reaching effects upon the industrial community at large and upon industrial enterprise, that the Bill would do grave damage to the credit and to the honour of this country. The Government of the day could not lay predatory hands upon any great industry without inflicting a hardship upon all the allied trades, and sending a shudder throughout every industrial centre of the country. If they introduced this vicious principle into legislation, where and when did they propose to draw the line? If they attacked licensed property to-day, with the same show of justice they might attack every other vested interest in the country to-morrow. Exactly the same doctrine would serve their purpose. There was no class of property that was not subject to some duty to the State, and licensed property as well as every other investment owed a duty to the State, and the different relations which they bore to the State was only a difference of degree. An honourable understanding had prevailed in this country for the past century that a trader seeking renewal of his licence would obtain it provided he was of good conduct. That understanding had been respected up to the present, but the Government now ignored it, and that could not be done without seriously injuring the credit and the honour of the State. The second part of the Bill dealt with the cause of temperance. It was proposed to abolish something like 30,000 licences; that might or might not promote the cause of temperance; but if the consumption of alcohol diminished in the same ratio that the licences diminished, all he could say was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have a very uneasy time of it. Let them assume for the sake of argument that this was a great temperance measure, that it was going to be a monumental measure of temperance reform, for which the Government took credit. If the abolition of public-houses brought that about, who were entitled to take credit for it? Not the State. It was the surviving two-thirds of the licensees who during the next fourteen years would have to pay for the extinction of the 30,000 licences. They were the people who were entitled to the credit, and they ought to be entitled to the gratitude of the nation if they brought about a great measure of sobriety in the English people. But what did they propose to do with these gentlemen? At the end of the reduction period, they were to wipe out their property as if it were nothing. They did not take them into consideration; they allowed them to live in agony for fourteen years and then they would sweep away their property without a farthing of compensation. In his opinion, that was as monstrous an act of injustice as ever any House of Commons had attempted to perpetrate. He would now come to the specific question. Was the taking away of licences without compensation just and equitable? In order to consider that question they must go back a long way. According to some hon. Gentlemen opposite they dealt with this transaction as if it were a matter of yesterday. That was not so. They must have regard to the fact that these licences had been in existence for a great number of years. They could not ignore the fact that licences had changed hands for large sums of money, and with the sanction and authority of the State. They must not forget that people were induced to put their money into this investment, and that even solicitors would advise their clients, and trustees were permitted, to put money into breweries and brewery concerns. They had made it a security and had given the sanction of Parliament for it to be dealt with as a continuing security. Could the House now, with any show of justice, say: "No, you have no security; it is not a continuing security, but only from year to year"? That was a proposal based on extreme injustice. If it was in his power to place this case before a jury of impartial men, of men sworn to do justice between man and man, of men unbiassed by political prejudices, unmoved by all political hatreds and political conflicts which had existed in the past over this question, he believed that any such jury would agree with him that this proposal was not just to the holders of licences. He would challenge right hon. Gentlemen opposite and their followers to find a jury of honest men in the country who would say they were acting rightly in this matter. He would go further and say that if they took twelve jurists from any country in the world and put the question to them: "Is this legislation which we are now proposing in keeping with the spirit of the legislation which this country has passed, and with the practice and custom which this country has observed in dealing with licences for the past half century?" they would say: "You have introduced a new and foreign element into your policy." Hon. Gentlemen opposite based their case on the celebrated decision of *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield*. He had recently gone over that decision, which was simply a decision that in a particular case where sufficient reasons were given the magistrate could not be compelled to grant a renewal of the licence. But one law after another had stated that the magistrates were bound to act in their judicial capacity, that they could not act arbitrarily or from mere caprice, and that so long as there was no valid objection to the renewal of a licence the magistrates were bound to renew it. Anyone who proposed to object to the renewal had to give notice of objection, and that notice had to be served on the licence-holder. Did not that imply that the magistrates meant to renew it, unless there was a valid objection to it, as a matter of duty? He considered that the right hon. Gentlemen who occupied the Treasury Bench had taken up an extraordinary attitude on this question. He read the remarks in that morning's paper of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who spoke at Bristol on Saturday, where he laid down an extraordinary doctrine. Referring to the gentlemen who occupied another place, he said that if they came on this occasion and stood between the people and their passionate desire for sobriety and temperance, their blood would be upon their own heads. That was an extraordinary statement from a responsible Minister. It said in effect that the Government for the time being was above the Constitution. It might proceed with reckless and extravagant legislation, and if anyone, even the Constitution, attempted to block the way, then let their blood be upon their own heads. That was what it meant. He would have asked the right hon. Gentleman if he had been in his place whether the Government of the day, which was the mere outcome of one general election, had the power to cancel arrangements entered into by the State during the past fifty years. Was it not bound by what the State had done? Could it use the right arm of the State and place it at the disposal of one section, of its own party, to wreak vengeance on its opponents? Let them put sophistry on one side and ask themselves was this a real measure of temperance reform. Was that the real object aimed at? Every impartially-minded man would agree that it was not. What was really aimed at was to bring revenue to the Exchequer. Would that do as much good as the Chancellor of the Exchequer contemplated? He might inflict suffering and hardship on individuals, and while bringing money into the Exchequer which ought to be circulating in other directions he would be bringing about a new form of poverty and distress among people who, perhaps, never experienced it before, and he would not be adding a fraction to the national wealth of the country. It would remain the same, and the money taken from those who were entitled to it would be spread over a large multitude. It was said that in the next fourteen years the owners of licensed houses would recompense themselves. He did not think even hon. Gentlemen opposite would say that that was reasonable. In the first place, for the next fourteen years they imposed a new burden on them, the burden of the compensation fund, which the Government themselves could not measure, and to which the licensees would have to contribute out of their hard-earned savings, and at the end of that time their licence was to be taken from them. They would be doing away not only with the licence but the goodwill which was sometimes as important as what was called the monopoly value. If they attempted to do that, they would strike a blow at one of the greatest incentives to industry, energy, and perseverance. He would ask hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to look at this not through jaundiced political eyes, but fairly as between man to man. He would ask them to imagine that they themselves had their money invested in licensed property. Ought they not to do as they would like to be done by? Was it just and fair that investments made under the sanction of Parliament for so long a period were now by one stroke of the Government pen to be wiped away for ever? It was unjust, and it must reflect upon the credit, the honour, and the dignity of this country. The authority of Mr. Gladstone had been claimed by gentlemen on both sides of the House, but Mr. Gladstone would never have dreamed of doing what the Government were now proposing. The small investors for the time being forgot to which party they belonged, and they were all united in looking to another place for a remedy for the wrong proposed in the Bill. No one regretted that more than he did, for he believed the action of the Government was going to give a long lease to the gentlemen on that side. He regretted that for his own country, but from the Government's action he believed it was inevitable. The Prime Minister at a former stage of the clause said that what they had to ask themselves was, was it wise, politic, or just that the time-limit should be attached to licences. His reply to that was that in his opinion it was unwise, impolitic, and unjust. He begged to move.

*MR. G. D. FABER (York) said he found himself in a position of great difficulty on Friday last, and the Government found themselves in a position of great absurdity. To-day their difficulty and the Government's absurdity were immeasurably increased, because Clause 3 as it would be amended, was absolutely different from the clause as they had been accustomed to know it in Committee. Clause 3 dealt with four topics—local option, monopoly value, the time-limit, and grocers' licences. In all these respects the clause was altered—in some respects fundamentally—as contrasted with the original position. Local option, as applied to Clause 2 for the purpose of new licences, had never been discussed at length—the principle had been, but not the machinery. The machinery had been incorporated for many purposes with Clause 3 which dealt with on-licences at the end of the reduction period. While local option was under discussion at an earlier period, there was room for doubt as to whether, when the end of the reduction period came, local option would *ipso facto* apply, as set up by Clause 2, to all old on-licenses, or whether it would require fresh legislation. Under the clause as amended to-day there was no longer any room for doubt upon the subject. The local option provisions under Clause 3 as they now saw it affected every on-licence in the country at the end of the reduction period. Nothing more need be done by Parliament. That was the first vital alteration. Hitherto there had been, and rightly, great doubt as to the meaning monopoly value. Now the Government defined it in Clause 24, which they would not reach until Thursday afternoon, yet they had to deal with the matter in this clause. That was new position No. 2. New position No. 3 was that the time-limit was extended, with all the restrictions that the extension involved, from fourteen to twenty-one years. Fourthly, and by no means least, they came to the extraordinary new position that the Government had taken up in the matter of grocers' licences. In fact the jack-in-the-box of Clause 3 had been the grocers' licences. He would trace the history of the Government action in regard to grocers' licences. Those licenses first came up for discussion on Clause 1. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University had moved on that clause to include the grocers' licences in the reduction period. It came to the vote, and Members on that side of the House for the greater part voted for it, not because they had the smallest feeling or prejudice against the grocer or his licences, but because they had a right to demand that the Government, when they brought in what they called an all-round thorough-going temperance measure should not include on-licences and leave out off-licences. They could not shut one door and leave the other open. The great cohorts of the Government, of course, gained the day, and off-licences were not included. But between the closing days of July and the early days of October a change for the time being seemed to come over the scene and the spirit of their dream, and one fine day the First Commissioner of Works put down upon the Amendment Paper words which brought off-licences as well as on-licences within the purview of Clause 3. It was on the Paper one day and discussed the next. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that under the clause as it then stood, local option would apply on the termination of the reduction period, not only to on-licences, but to off. The first Commissioner got up much fluttered and discomposed and said it had not been their intention to bring grocers' licences under the local option clause and if that was the effect they would put the matter right on Report. That raised a very interesting psychological question. He wondered what made the right hon. Gentleman so hurriedly alter his mind when he found that local option included off-licences as well as on. The right hon. Gentleman ran away from his own Amendment and the Government were running away to-day. Was it one of the many powers that seemed to stand behind the throne and pull the strings that made the right hon. Gentleman, after a sudden access of virtue under the influence of which he included off-licences, hurriedly withdraw them? At any rate, the position was vitally altered to-day. They were in this further difficulty, that Clause 5, into which a long new Amendment dealing with grocers' licences was inserted, came on for discussion, not now under this compartment of the guillotine but in the next compartment. There he found himself in a difficulty as he did not know how far he would be in order in discussing the subject of grocers' licences now. They had been placed in an impossible position and had got into a perfect slough of despond. The subject they were now dealing with contained some of the most vital topics of the whole measure, and yet they were obliged to piece together the Amendments to see how the matter stood. They had to look into Clause 2 which dealt with local option in order to see how far it extended to Clause 3, they had also to discover how far part of Clause 5 which dealt with grocers' licences would dovetail in with the proposal now under discussion. This was one of the most impossible measures ever introduced into Parliament, and yet on one of the closing days of the debate they were confronted with an entirely new position. He had done his best to apply himself to this new aspect of the case, and he had no hesitation in saying that the position created was an intolerable one. The way monopoly value and the time-limit were applied in this measure constituted an entirely new doctrine. A certain reduction period he could conceivably understand, although he was against it, but a reduction period plus the recovery of monopoly value by the State at the end of a time-limit outraged his common-sense and violated his sense of justice. Where did the Government find any warrant for this double-headed proposition? Did they find it in any of the judgments in the Law Courts or in any of the speeches of great statesmen? Did they find it in the practice adopted by the Executive when taxing licensed property for death duties and taxation generally? They found no warranty for that proposition anywhere, not even in the Minority Report of the Licensing Commission. There was nothing in that Report warranting this great act of spoliation and depredation. There was not a word in *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* that afforded a scintilla of authority for this change in the law. No new law was laid down in that case, but simply a new interpretation of the law, and the Act of 1904 was necessitated because justices did not conform to but violated the decision in *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield*. Many benches of magistrates thought they could after that decision take away licences merely if they thought they were superfluous, but that decision did not lay down anything of the kind. *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* laid down that a discretion must be judicially exercised in every case, and there was no warranty whatever for any such doctrine as that which was laid down in this Bill, under which 30,000 licences were to be compulsorily extinguished in fourteen years. What was a licence? A licence was a restricted privilege granted by the State renewed every year as a matter of form, and by the practice of centuries had been renewed every year except in cases of misconduct or proved superfluity. What did the Government propose to take by this new doctrine of recovery of monopoly value? They were going to take over everything that the money, the industry and ability of perhaps generations of traders had superimposed upon that bare permission to trade granted by the State. That permission was originally a mere skeleton which the holder of the licence had clothed with flesh and blood and made into a living business. The Government were now proposing to take power to recover, not only that bare permission, but also the whole superstructure which had been reared upon it. Such a course was not warranted by anything which had been done in the past. What had been the practice of the State in the past in exacting toll on licensed property upon the death of the owner? Had the State attempted to split up the value of licensed property, dividing the bricks and mortar and ground from the monopoly value of the business? The State had never adopted that attitude. When the owner of licensed property died, the State always taxed the whole of the property upon its market value as the property of the owner, just in the same way as the business of a tailor, a butcher, or a baker was treated. The State had exacted millions out of the estimated market value of licensed property. Under the Death Duties Act of 1893, the value ordered to be taken was the market value, and it was monstrous to turn round now and declare that licences belonged to the State, and that the State was merely going to resume its own. The State could not play fast and loose like that with property if it wished to set an example of probity to the nation. In 1880, Mr. Gladstone said that if they were going to suppress licences they must pay for them. In

1890, after *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield*, Mr. Gladstone further stated that the licence-holder must be taken to be aware of the law as it stood, but not if the position was fundamentally altered. What was the new position? They were proposing to take away 30,000 or 40,000 licences in fourteen years under a cast-iron system of reduction, and the trade was being compelled to provide itself with a beggarly compensation. The State would not pay one farthing towards it, and yet at the end of the time-limit the State was proposing to appropriate the monopoly value. A new position from top to bottom had been created, and he did not see how anyone who still had any respect for the rights of property could take any such course as that which was suggested in this Bill. He begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 15, to leave out Clause 3."—(*Mr. Patrick White.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out. to the word 'and,' in page 3, line 18, stand part of the Bill."

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said the hon. Member for York had expressed his general indignation at the proposals of the Government, but he had expected him to give the House the benefit of the great knowledge he possessed regarding the business portion of the Bill. For his own part, he wished to draw attention to the great difference between Clauses 2 and 3. Clause 2 dealt with new licences, and he did not think it mattered much whether local option applied to them or not. Under Clause 3 the idea was that local option should apply to what had hitherto been known as on-licences. Great inconvenience arose on a previous stage of the Bill because they were unable to discuss how this would work out. On Clause 2 it was decided by an Amendment which the Government accepted that parishes were to be the areas for voting. When they came to the question of on-licences, they found that there were 800 parishes in the country containing a population of fifty each. He knew one parish where there was a population of only seven. He asked whether the Government intended to leave the position as it now stood with reference to the voting for local option in tiny areas, or whether these areas would be grouped in some form or other as was done under the Local Government Act of 1894. He wished to put his next point in the form of a query to the Government. It had been said on many platforms, and also in the House, that the intention of the concession made by the Prime Minister when he extended the time-limit by giving a seven years free run beyond the fourteen years period was that something in the nature of priority should be given to the tenants. Would it not be well to put in the clause some words which would give to the sitting tenant, subject to good conduct and other favourable conditions, the first claim to consideration at the end of the period? He went a little bit further. He reminded the House that the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill stated that he would be prepared to consider reasonable Amendments, and since then another Cabinet Minister had said the same thing. He asked both Gentlemen, and also the House, to contemplate what would be the effect of the proposals as they had them now. Originally it was proposed that the time-limit should be fourteen years, and now there was to be in addition a seven years free run. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] He did not know what the proper expression was. It was seven years grace without charging the monopoly value. He thought the seven years would be calculated as an expectancy for the purposes of compensation, but he now found that the Government took the arbitrary figure of three years. He had never heard how they brought about that calculation, or why they had chosen the period of three years. He admitted that the concession of seven years without charging the monopoly value was a very great concession, but unfortunately it was deliberately clogged by subsection (2) (*a*) of the clause which said—

"The foregoing provisions of this Act as to local option shall take effect as if a majority of two-thirds of the votes given were required for the carrying of a Resolution instead of a bare majority."

Temperance reformers had said regretfully that the present state of public opinion would not make the two-thirds majority effective, and he was equally certain from a totally different standpoint that the probabilities were that the two-thirds majority would not be secured. If, therefore, all sides were agreed that it was not likely to be got, why on earth could not the provision be dropped? The effect of the provision being in the Bill was most disorganising. It absolutely got rid of the security implied by the grant of the seven years extra run. By the clogging of that concession with the local option provision they absolutely took away the financial advantage from the point of view of insurers. He was against the time-limit altogether. He was certain that the evil effects produced by the Bill would be much more serious than had been generally stated in the House. He could state from his own knowledge that there were a great many small men engaged in the trade who had received notice to pay money which they were indebted. He would not debate the question whether the Bill was or was not likely to be thrown out in another place, but he wanted the House to remember that the financial effect up to the present had been to derange and upset altogether the monetary arrangements of a vast number of people in the trade. The Solicitor-General the other night, in a tone of pride, drew attention to the value of brewery shares. He ventured to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he had looked into the value of some of the guarantee society shares which had guaranteed brewery debentures. If he would turn his attention to that class of reading, he would be able to tell the House whether it coincided with the statement he had made as to the value of brewery shares. He hoped the Government would give the House some information on the two points he had raised.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.) said the mover of the Amendment quoted from a speech made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and charged him with attempting to set the Government above the Constitution. That would be a very great evil if it could be done. What did this Amendment propose? To his mind it proposed to put the licensed trade above the Constitution, and that would be a very much greater evil. If the Constitution was to be over-ruled at all, he should prefer that it should be done by a responsible Government rather than by an irresponsible trade which had never considered anything but its own selfish interests. What was the position with regard to this matter? Temperance reformers had never for one moment been in doubt with regard to the tenure of licences by licence-holders, and, what was more, the law on the subject had never been in doubt. All that the Government proposed to do now was to put in force the law that ought to have been enforced years ago. The champions of the licensed trade occupied a somewhat curious position in this matter. For years they had denounced every practical temperance proposal that had been brought forward. They had talked time and again about confiscation and the insecurity of their position for the last half-century or more. What had the House heard to-day? They had heard of the security which the licensed trade had occupied during the last half-century as an argument for not disturbing it now. That only proved that the longer a reform was delayed the more difficult it was to carry it out. He, therefore, contented himself with expressing the hope that this reform would not be any longer delayed, and that the clause would be retained in the Bill.

*MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich) expressed the hope that the Government, while retaining Clause 3, would modify it in one or two particulars. Those who were not absolutely prejudiced in regard to this question were practically agreed that the time-limit was a desirable thing. He had listened with accustomed amazement to the speech of the hon. Member for York. That hon. Member seemed to adopt an attitude more common in the country than in the House; namely, that the property of the licence, whatever it was, approximated to that of freehold property. Surely that had been disproved in the House over and over again. It had been denied in set terms by the Leader of the Opposition and was not held in the House by anyone whose opinion was really worthy of consideration.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): It is held by the Lord Chancellor.

*Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH: I was not aware of that. I am speaking of the Members of this House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Lord Chancellor said that the Act of 1904 conferred the freehold.

*Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH: I am not qualified to argue that with the right hon. Gentleman. May I point out one or two considerations which appeal to my mind. If the licence approximates to the value of the freehold, I should like to know why the right hon. Gentleman made the trade pay their own compensation.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Member appeals to me I will not apologise for interrupting him. I have always denied, both before and after the Act of 1904 was passed, that there was a freehold tenure in licences, but the present occupants of the Treasury Bench and the highest legal authority in the Government, namely, the Lord Chancellor held, contrary to my opinion, that the Act of 1904 did confer a right of freehold, and that therefore they now possess it by Act of Parliament.

*Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH said that he found himself in a greater difficulty. He would be sorry, indeed, to pit his judgment against the high opinion quoted by the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought to commonsense men these considerations did appeal; and he would ask if the licence was freehold why should it be taken away for misconduct? He had never heard of freehold property being taken away even for misconduct. Surely there was another consideration, one more apposite than any of the two previous considerations—and that was that the State might multiply the number of licences indefinitely, and thus deprive them of any monopoly value whatsoever. The State might do it, and the present Government might do it, but out of consideration for the morals of the people no Government had ever contemplated doing it. In spite of what had been said by high authorities, he believed that a time-limit was feasible, just and necessary. The only further considerations which appealed to him were as to what conditions should prevail during the operation of the time-limit and what was to happen at the end of the time-limit. He should like to join with his hon. friend the Member for Kidderminster in an appeal to the Government, who had made so considerable a concession over and above the fourteen years provisionally arranged—to remove the operation of local option during the subsequent seven years. The seven years additional close season, as it might be called, was given by way of a great concession; and it was very highly appreciated in many quarters of the House. But he could not help thinking that the greater part of its virtue was taken away if local option were allowed to operate during that period. His own opinion was that the licence-holder was entitled to certainty and confidence during those very drastic operations. Nothing could be more harassing to a man engaged in any business or trade than not to know what was to happen in his business. Under the proposals of the Bill he had found nothing had been more objected to by the representatives of the trade than the uncertainty that attached to certain parts of them. The Government might make one other concession which he did not think would impair the value of their Bill. The concession he asked was that those who were licence-holders at the end of the time-limit should be given a preference when the new licences were granted. He believed that the Bill as amended would make enormously in the direction of temperance. Speaking for himself, he would not like to be responsible for any share in rejecting so valuable a measure.

*Mr. GRETTON (Rutland) said that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had made what was in some respects a remarkable speech. It was a compound of fulsome praise of the Government and of a complaint against the provisions of the Bill. He understood that the hon. Member's main contention why this clause ought to stand in the Bill was that it was not confiscation, properly speaking; that licences were not, in his opinion, freehold property; and that therefore they might be taken away and not regarded as property at all. He noticed that, as this controversy proceeded, there had been a great tendency on the part of other hon. Members to take a very similar point of view. They proceeded on the assumption that no property was real property unless it could be classed as freehold property. But those who had any knowledge of the different forms of property were aware that that was absurd. There were copyhold property, annuities, and many other kinds of property which were of undoubted value, which were all marketable, and in which the individual owner had an inalienable right. On the other hand, in relation to licensed property there were certain covenants which had to be fulfilled. He did not think that any responsible lawyer or responsible business man would say that, because a licence was not a freehold property, it was not real property and ought not to be treated as such. Of course, as in the case of all other kinds of property, the State had some rights over it. The State had always retained a right to tax property for the benefit of the community, and it had exercised that right very fully in the case of the levy of death duties and probate duty on licensed property. It was, therefore, rather late in the day for hon. Members to say that a licence was not real property. It was real property, and as such had existed for a great number of years. The hon. Member had argued that the value which attached to the licence might be very easily destroyed by an unlimited grant of new licences. Of course that was true. Many hon. Members knew that the State did by the Licensing Act of 1830 take that very course. Down to 1872 there was a very free issue of licences of that kind, but the result was that there was practically no monopoly value in a licence. The monopoly value was, however, recreated by the action of the State itself, and it was too late in the day for hon. Members opposite to claim that individuals had no right of property in the licence. The State itself had taxed this property and had taken no action whatever to secure for itself the monopoly value during all these years. But the Government was now going to take away far more than the monopoly value. They were going to take the business goodwill and the personal goodwill in the business. The hon. Member had made an appeal that the licence-holder should have some preference at the end of the time-limit when the licences to be issued under this Bill were to be issued as new licences. Nobody seemed to notice the very curious inconsistency between this suggestion that there was a personal goodwill and a business goodwill attaching to a licence which should be considered at the end of the reduction period, and the fact that this business goodwill and personal goodwill were to receive no compensation whatever. The two lines of policy were absolutely inconsistent, and could not be reconciled. The Government had made what they called concessions. They said that there should be an extension for seven years at the end of the reduction period of fourteen years which they estimated would be worth three years additional compensation in the case of licences to fall in at the end of fourteen years. He did not know on what basis they put that figure of three years. He spoke with a full sense of responsibility, and after consultation with those interested in the question. The concession, so-called, was no concession whatever. It did not meet the difficulties and necessities of the case, and there was no man in a responsible position in the licensing trade who would for one moment accept it. Let hon. Members consider the conditions to which licences would be subject during this seven years. The licences would, during that time, be subject to all the risks of the local veto and to all the onerous and restrictive conditions in the clauses of the Bill under which magistrates could issue licences. They would be subject to further optional reductions if the justices chose to take that course with the assent of the Licensing Commission. The only condition which would lapse during the seven years would be a further charge on the monopoly value. It was obvious to anyone who considered the conditions of the seven years that it was no concession whatever. Many figures and estimates had been produced to the House, the outcome of the work of experts and competent authorities, but he would not trouble to repeat them; they were within the recollection of hon. Members who had taken part in the discussion, and they were not to be so lightly swept aside as of no value as the Under-Secretary seemed to think. The Government had at last committed themselves to a definite statement as to a reduction period of fourteen years and a further seven years. It was now possible to estimate the value of the reduction, the value of the seven years, and the result to the businesses which would be affected. The figures of those businesses which were in the possession of hon. Members remained unshaken or unaffected by what the Government had done by the Amendment they proposed to introduce. It had been shown over and over again that the majority of the brewery companies of the country would be absolutely ruined by the reduction period and the confiscation of licences at the end of it, and in nearly all cases the individual licence-holder would suffer ruin. The compensation if these licences were reduced during the fourteen years time-limit would not amount to half the value, and in the majority of cases it would be less than one-quarter. The value of the property was to be taken away. This was said to be a great temperance reform, based on the principle of reduction, but in his opinion, and he thought in that of experienced men, no such great reform could be expected. If it was to be based on such a principle of confiscation, in his opinion, that reform would be purchased too dearly, by the ruin of a vast number of individuals, who had been conducting a difficult and intricate trade under regulations which the State had laid down and strongly enforced. He believed it would be purchased too dearly by throwing out of employment a vast number of people, not only directly employed by the trade, but employed in innumerable other trades, which supplied materials and other wants of the licensing trade in many directions. He believed that if this reduction was to take place, it could only take place under very different conditions from those embodied in the clause they were now considering. If the State desired in fourteen years to reduce the licences by one-third, or some similar proportion, it would have to forego the confiscation of the remaining licensed property at the end of that time. Nobody objected to the State taking the property in the public interest if it took means to see that that property was properly paid for. The Government had carefully avoided in this clause and in other clauses of the Bill taking that course, and he and other hon. Members on that side continued strenuously to oppose Clause 3, because they believed it was robbery, confiscation, and spoliation, and would not achieve the temperance reform which the Government expected from it.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln), who was indistinctly heard in the Press Gallery, was understood to say that the debate had travelled over very familiar ground, and he hardly thought it was worth while to go into the argument as to whether a licence was a freehold or whether it had been recognised by the law as a continuing interest. But there were a few points in regard to this clause on which he should like to say a few words. Mr. Gladstone's opinion had been quoted. It was possible to quote words of Mr. Gladstone that reduction of licences if it pretended to the honour of a remedy would be an imposture. But he had already quoted the real explanation, namely, that Mr. Gladstone believed reduction of licences would fail unless the monopoly value of licences was also dealt with. Mr. Gladstone called these monopoly values the most deadly enemies with which temperance reformers had to grapple, and they were grappling with these interests on that occasion. They had found out how pernicious and obstructive they were to temperance reform. Hon. Members could not quote Mr. Gladstone against Clause 3, because in his view Clause 1 would not be a real reform unless it was combined with Clause 3. They were asked where did the Government get this idea of the time-limit? They got the first part of Clause 3 from the forty-four Unionist Members who voted with Sir William Houldsworth in favour of it, and the second part of Clause 3 from the Licensing Commission, and also from the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Peel, who voted for it in the House of Lords. If it was "wise and right" in the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury it was wise enough for a man of his political opinions. He would like to take up the interruption which was made by the Leader of the Opposition a moment before, when he said that the present Lord-Chancellor had stated in this House in 1904 that the Act of that year gave freehold tenure and that the Government were, therefore, bound by that argument which was put forward against the Bill of that year. But when that argument was put forward the right hon. Gentleman himself dismissed it and said it was a "gross fallacy," and he did more, he gave assurances that the Act of 1904, if passed into law, should not obstruct in any way the progress of temperance reform. The present Leader of the Opposition then said—

> "I believe that the anxiety about the time-limit is due to a fear lest we are shutting the door on any kind of temperance reform in the future other than the present Bill. There is nothing I know in this Bill which is going to stand in the way of any future reform."

Lord Lansdowne said it much more strongly in another place. He said—

> "It is wholly incorrect to say that there is anything whatever in the Bill to close the door against any larger scheme of reform, should it be hereafter the desire of the legislature that such a scheme should be passed. My noble friend Lord Grey, who may be regarded as knowing something of the scheme with which he is so honourably identified, told your Lordships that there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the adoption of his scheme, and what he said is equally true of any wider, more extensive, and far-reaching measure that may hereafter be devised."

These assurances were expressly taken note of by those who were Leaders of the Opposition then, and who were now Members of the Government. They accepted those assurances that the Bill did not create any new continuing interest, but merely recognised the continuing interest which had grown up before, and he thought it was largely due to those pledges that the Bill managed to get through at all. In the face of that, was it not fair to contend that the terms embodied in the Bill were fair? Indeed, was not twenty-one years an extravagant price? How much more would they have even if it was freehold—and it was something less than freehold. Their view was that here the State had created a monopoly value or suffered it to grow up in the hands of individuals, retaining all the time the right to terminate it at annual intervals, and they claimed, therefore, that if the State gave twenty-one years during which the licence-holder could recoup, out of the high profits of the monopoly, the value of that monopoly, it was an ample term. He thought it was too long, and he guarded himself against being supposed to admit that twenty-one years was necessary, but the Government had granted it. Under this clause they had twenty-one years time-limit, subject to certain risks during the last seven years, but they had also a new definition of monopoly value, and although it was not in order to discuss it that definition was to be looked at and taken into account in considering the financial effect of this scheme. What did that new definition really do? It did two things. In the first place, it excluded the goodwill of the tenant. He was himself impressed by the view put forward by the hon. Member for Kingston, that if they had accepted the definition of monopoly value to be found in the Act of 1904, they might have taken away the goodwill of the tenant and the capitalised value of the retail profits of the trade, because if they looked at that definition it seemed to cover all the elements of value which could be held to be included in the licence. But the new definition was more guarded. The hon. Member was extremely indignant with the Government for proposing to take away all that the tenant put into his business, but what they were going to take away was the value which had passed into rental value, because the monopoly value was measured by the difference in rental value under Schedule A between the premises licensed and unlicensed. Therefore, this definition would not take away the tenant's personal goodwill unless the owner had himself taken it in the form of rent. Therefore, the Government could not get it unless the brewer owner had confiscated the goodwill of the tenant to its full value. He believed further that this definition of the monopoly value would allow the State to get hold of the value created by the monopoly but would leave to the brewer the normal profits which he would get if there were free trade in drink. What it came to was that in 1930 they were going to levy a high licence duty on brewers and licences. They could do that to-day. They could do it next year. Yet the Government had been accused of looking at the matter from the financial side. If they had done so, they would not have proceeded upon these lines of a time-limit. If they were thinking of getting only addition to the revenue, another road was still open to them. As regarded the twenty-one years time-limit, subject to the risk in the last seven years, the hon. Member who spoke last said the figures of trade experts still stood unaffected by the extension, but undoubtedly the seven years should make material difference in the figures. The figures of the prominent firm of Orgill, Marks, and Barley should be received with caution; they were not correct in some items of calculation, facts and elements. They had doubled the amount of money which was required to write down the value of licences in twenty-one years. Instead of taking it as a 5 per cent. sinking fund they had taken it as a 10 per cent. fund. Why, he did not understand, but if such games were played with figures, anything could be proved. On the basis of a twenty-one years standard, he had made an elaborate allowance for the amount of the capital value which it was required to write off. He believed that a very large amount, if not the whole, could be written off, and yet on the figures the owners could get 8 per cent. on their capital. As to the risk of magisterial discretion and local option, he contended it was an insurable risk. The amount saved from the cessation the compensation levy would amply allow for the insurance of licences. He did not say that local option was not a risk, but it was an insurable one. £60,000,000 of licensed property was now actually insured. It had often been denied. It had been denied for debating purposes, but nevertheless all this property was insured against the risk of the loss of the licence; against misconduct mainly. But he knew from his own experience that there was insurance against the risk of non-renewal, and if the Licences' Insurance Corporation Guarantee Fund, Ltd., would hand over their business to Lloyd's, he was certain that the members of Lloyd's would in 1923 be very glad to insure these licences against restrictive conditions of magisterial discretion and local option. What was this risk? Would the risk, after 30,000 licences had been extinguished, be greater than in the year 1901, after the Royal Commission had reported that there must be a great and immediate reduction?

Mr. YOUNGER: But on payment of compensation.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERTS said that even subject to compensation there was the risk of a great change in the licensing law. The premium quoted then was 4s. for £100, and if the risk was that in 1901, he believed it would not be greater in 1923. If so, it would be three times covered by the amount of the compensation levy; that sum would avail to pay the risk three times over of local option and magisterial decisions. He trusted therefore that what was called a close-time for seven years after 1923 would not be given. He believed all the facts went to prove that the greater the security of tenure given to the licensed trade the worse the conduct of the trade would be. He asked with all respect the right hon. Gentleman opposite to consider that point of view. The right hon. Gentleman had said he had always regarded the licensed trade as exactly the same as other trades, and if security of tenure was desirable in other trades it was desirable in this. He had passed the Act of 1904 to give security of tenure. Let him consider what happened in the period of free trade in drink between 1830 and 1870. It was clear during the whole of that period there had been a steady deterioration in the conduct of these houses. He felt that during the seven additional years which were given the conduct of the trade would steadily deteriorate. The trade required control, otherwise they might as well give free trade at once. One other point on which he wished to touch was as to the position of local option in the whole working out of this scheme. He did not wish to go into the question of local option on its merits. He was a firm and convinced believer in that system. The more he studied it the more he was convinced that, while reduction might be of great value and utility, the real remedy here as in our Colonies, the United States, Norway or Sweden, was to clear areas of public-houses wherever they could get public opinion behind them. [" Prohibition."] Prohibition, yes; and he would like hon. Members to make a real mental effort and to distinguish between prohibition as it was established in Maine fifty-four years ago by one Act of the State, and permissive local option in small areas where they might get a partition of territory between licences and no licences. There was a very great difference between the two systems, and they were not proposing state prohibition to-day, but if he were challenged about Maine, he would point out that after thirty or forty years experience of prohibition the men who lived in the State of Maine, and knew the facts, were in favour of the system, and in all except thirteen local government areas of the State, they had voted in support of it when a referendum on the question had been taken.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): Does the hon. Gentleman, speaking as a temperance reformer, say that prohibition has been a success?

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said that in the view of Maine itself—it was a democratic State—it was a success, and there was not a single State, Canadian province, or American state around Maine which had not adopted the plan of local option recommended in this Bill. In Massachusetts, where the urban conditions were similar to those in England, and where there was density of population equal to that of England, the system, in his judgment, was an unqualified success. He did not wish to argue the point further, but he believed that under this system in a no-licence area they would get rid of two-thirds of the drunkenness, and if they could diminish the evil to that extent they would be doing all that was hoped for by the Licensing Commission. Quite apart from its merits, he held that local option ought to be regarded as an integral part of the Bill. They were told that they must have a time-limit, and that it would not be fair to establish local option at once, but if they proposed it at the end of a time-limit they were then told that they could not bind future Parliaments. But there must be some date at which it was possible that a scheme should be enacted. He thought the evidence went to prove that where local option was proposed a time-limit was always demanded. A time-limit of five to eight years was demanded in New South Wales, and if anybody said it was impossible to legislate ten years in advance, he would refer to the Victorian Licensing Act of 1906, where they carried local option to come into force ten years afterwards. If they waited until 1923, of course the trade would demand another ten years. What they wanted was local option now, and not merely on its merits; he would also put it on a wider ground than that. Everybody must have felt that the expectation of the renewal of licences which had grown up within the last few years was a thing which they would have been glad to avoid. They had had a system of annual licences in which the State kept control over the licences, but the expectation of the renewal had grown up. It was not for want of a perfectly clear statement of law as in the Act of 1828, when the law said that the licence should be granted for one whole year and no longer; and in 1869 again it said exactly the same thing. But in spite of that, the expectation of renewal had grown up, and now they had, as the result of the Act of 1904, the doctrine established that as soon as the liquor trade expected anything though, it had no legal right to it, the State must pay cash down. They found a further illustration in this very Bill. When the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition introduced his new system as to new licences they were told that they were to have no compensation. In spite of that, however, the expectation had already grown up, and they had provided in this very Bill that if a new licence granted since 1904 was suppressed during the currency of the reduction period, they would have to pay compensation for a portion of the monopoly value. Therefore, there was real danger of a revival of the expectation. Why was it that they had not this doctrine of expectation in the Colonies and United States? Ought they not to take some additional precautions against this doctrine of expectation which grew up insidiously and impalpably, and against which the State really ought to guard? Directly the people themselves had the power to say they would not have licences in their midst, then the expectation of renewal, which might grow up under the apathy of the justices, and owing to the tendency to go along in the old rut, must cease. He thought the Government were wise and logical in making local option an integral and ssential part of the Bill.

Mr. Charles Roberts.

EARL WINTERTON said he had not intended to take part in the debate, but he could not allow the extraordinary statements of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down to go unchallenged. Might he say at the outset that no one recognised more strongly than he that the hon. Gentleman had always been a most whole-hearted adherent of the cause, but he thought the very strength of his belief and sincerity had led him away, and made him take a view of things which was not warranted by the facts. It was impossible for him, without trespassing too long on the time of the House, to go into all the arguments that the hon. Gentleman had used, but he would like to refer to one or two of them. The hon. Member had alluded, for instance, to prohibition in the State of Maine, and he had said, very rightly, that it was impossible for anyone to judge of the effects of the principle in that instance. The only comment he would make on that was that the quotations which they on that side of the House had made as to the effects of prohibition in the State of Maine were taken, not from any publication of their own, but from a book written by one of the hon. Member's colleagues, and, in other respects, a supporter of the Bill. Could anyone point to any documentary evidence bearing out the contention that prohibition had been a success? All the evidence available was to the effect that it had been a dismal failure all over the world. They could read the official documents of the War Office of the United States, Foreign Office Reports, Consular Reports sent home by our representatives in the States, and he did not believe there was a single word to be found which would support the idea that prohibition had been a success. It was impossible to understand fully what the position was in the State of Maine, but it was true that the greatest supporters of prohibition had been those interested in the sale of drink, because it was so much easier to sell drink in a prohibition area without licences than when the licences were in vogue. That was a well-known fact. He deprecated very strongly the veiled attack made by the hon. Gentleman upon the veracity of a certain firm of auditors, a well-known firm which had been constantly mentioned in the course of the debate.

The hon. Gentleman made a veiled, but nevertheless determined, attack upon their figures.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: On their figures, yes, but not on their veracity. Hon. Members had swallowed the figures wholesale. But on investigation he was sure they would find that the figures must be discounted very largely.

EARL WINTERTON said that if the figures the firm took were said not to be true, that was an attack on their veracity. The business of the firm was to vouch for the veracity of their figures at any rate. It hon. Members made an attack on their figures they were making the most serious attack which could be made on their business reputation. This question had been debated *ad nauseam*, and he thought they had shown, to the satisfaction of the public at any rate, that the financial proposals under this clause would be unjust, and that it was impossible to look at them in any other way. The hon. Member had referred to Mr. Gladstone's statement that monopoly value was a great bar in the way of temperance reform. No one denied that he said that, but Mr. Gladstone did not deny the existence of the monopoly value, and that was really the whole point. Mr. Gladstone admitted the existence of monopoly value, and he saw that the difficulty was to deal with it justly. But what had the Government done? According to the hon. Gentleman, they had improved upon the policy of their late leader, because they had found a way out of the difficulty, and they had found it by temporarily forgetting the meaning of the words *meum* and *tuum*, by doing a thing that Mr. Gladstone never proposed and probably never would have done under any circumstances. They had taken a thing practically without making payment for it. That was the whole point of the Opposition's argument against the clause, and that was why they could not accept it as anything but unjust and unfair. The hon. Member for Droitwich, had illustrated in his speech the very imperfect knowledge that hon. Gentlemen opposite had of the terms and of the effect of their own Bill, and incidentally the dilemma which both he and his Government were in over this matter. He began by attacking the hon. Member for York for having said that the licence was a freehold. His hon. friend denied having said so, but the hon. Member for Droitwich went on to say that the Leader of the Opposition had never laid down any such statement exactly, but the hon. Gentleman's own Government had said so, and that was the difficulty in which the Government had put themselves by their attitude on this Bill and by the wild statements which they made in 1904 and since. They accused the Opposition of having made a licence into a freehold; they had said it again and again, and he believed the Prime Minister himself had said so. The hon. Member for Droitwich showed in his speech that he was quite unaware that his own party had taken up that line. It only illustrated the muddle and the dilemma in which the Government and their supporters found themselves. The hon. Member said that nothing was more harassing than to have to conduct one's trade under feelings of uncertainty. He was delighted to think that the hon. Gentleman, a supporter of the Bill, had himself supplied the principal argument against it, and it would enable some of his friends below the gangway who had been somewhat slow to see the real point of the Bill to get a true insight into the clause, for that was why the Opposition considered the clause, however amended, to be essentially unjust and unfair. It was because they said that no trade could be legitimately conducted with the menacing shadow over its head that they were so opposed to the clause. The hon. Gentleman incidentally remarked, *a propos* of the question of freehold, that if a licence was a freehold it could not be taken away for misconduct. He did not know whether that was very relevant to the discussion, but as a matter of fact there were instances practically of a freehold being taken away for misconduct. In the case of insanitary property the local authority could order its demolition. He maintained that the hon. Gentleman had himself supplied the reason why this clause could not be accepted, and he appealed with confidence to the justice of hon. Members opposite to support the Amendment to omit the clause.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath) who was indistinctly heard, said the position they took up was that any money compensation paid in respect of licences should not come from the State but from the trade itself, and that was quite distinct from the question whether licences as they now stood were anything approaching the nature of a freehold. It was most important to recollect that the principle was clearly established by the Leader of the Opposition in the Act of 1904, and he supported the principle underlying the clause on account not so much of the arguments addressed from that side of the House as of those from the right hon. Gentleman himself, who expressly on more than one occasion stated that he saw no objection to the principle of a time-limit dealing with the reduction of licences. That was a most important position for him to have taken up, and, indeed, the only logical and straightforward position that he could take up, and such a position, of course, that the whole House would expect him to take up. The principle of the time-limit was conceded by the right hon. Gentleman and by all who had gone into this matter from the point of view of the relation of the State to its own property. They heard a great deal about interference with property, but it was most important to ask whose property. They were dealing with the property of the State, and the Leader of the Opposition himself had said the principle of the time-limit was one which could be fairly applied in dealing with this class of investments. The sole question with which the House was concerned was this: Were the propositions of the Government, in relation to the time-limit, just and equitable, or were they not? It had been suggested that fourteen years was too short. To meet that the Government had extended it to twenty-one, and at the end of that time the State would resume its own property. He had been disposed to ask hon. Gentlemen opposite this question. Suppose the Government decided that the time-limit, instead of twenty-one years should be fifty? Surely they would have been able to accept that? It was simply a question of argument between both sides, not as between freehold and otherwise, but how long the time-limit should be. The position immediately appeared to be clear if they said that a certain number of years might be fair and another was unfair. One clear point came out from all this discussion, that the people of the country were absolutely determined to get back into their own hands the licences which belonged to the State. They were determined to get their own property back into their own control. They were also determined that no State money should go by way of compensation in respect of these licences. The House was shut in by the whole process of legislation, especially during the past four or five years, and the only way out of the difficulty was the time-limit, and the compensation to be paid in respect of it must come from the trade itself; they were, therefore, face to face with the position, whether the time-limit was a reasonable or an unreasonable one. A good deal of the discussion that had taken place was beside the point in arguing whether a licence was a freehold or not. Surely the whole point of criticism was this. Was the twenty-one years suggested by the Government reasonable or was it not? He should prefer to see that other seven years quite unclogged by any condition other than that of the justices' discretion. As they had had to make concessions, it would be better to make a clear outright concession as to the other seven years so that the licensed trade might know where they were.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess I had hoped that before this hour was reached the Government would have given some explanation of the general policy embodied in this clause. Let it be observed, we have never had either an explanation or a justification of this clause as it now stands, because, as was pointed out by my hon. friend the Member for York, the clause is an entirely different one from that which was explained on the First Reading, defended on the Second Reading, and brought before the House on the Committee stage. It is a new clause, which in its new shape has never been explained or justified by the Government. I shall come to one or two points on which I think we require further elucidation before I sit down, but on the general aspect of the question I am sure the whole House will agree with me, and I am surprised that the Government should allow two hours and a quarter to elapse without giving any explanation of their new proposal. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down and the hon. Gentleman who preceded him have done me the honour to quote, or rather to paraphrase, the opinions which I expressed in 1904. The opinions which I expressed then are precisely the opinions which I have expressed whenever this subject has come up for discussion since. I have never wavered, and have never seen any reason to alter them. They are perfectly clear, and perfectly consistent with the Parliamentary course which I have taken upon this Bill. I have never professed that the Act of 1904 gave a freehold tenure; I have never contended that before 1904 there was a freehold tenure; and my quarrel with the Government has never been that they are taking away a freehold tenure without compensation. My complaint is that they are taking away property without compensation, and I presume there is no hon. Gentleman in this House who needs to be told that there is property which does not amount to freehold but which requires compensation. We sometimes hear hon. Gentlemen talk as if they had forgotten this very elementary and obvious truth; but when reminded of it I presume that even the least impartial among them, if there are any who deserve that criticism, will admit that property of less than full freehold tenure is and ought to be as sacred in the opinion of this House, and has, indeed, received as full and serious consideration from this House in the past as property of the full freehold value. That has been my consistent opinion. What has been the consistent opinion of the occupants of the Treasury bench, or have they any consistent opinion? Their opinion, as far as I remember it, was that, before 1904, no man had property in a licence at all, that a licence was the property of the State, that any value which it had was given by the State and might be taken away by the State or by the magistrates, or, if Parliament so directed, by a majority of the ratepayers at any time without compensation when the licence came up for consideration at the end of the year. That was their view up to 1904. That is not their view now, I understand, because that is not the way in which they are proposing to treat licences. What change has taken place since 1904? We were attacked day after day and continuously because we had given a freehold tenure to the owners of licences. If that freehold tenure was given in 1904 it was given by the supreme legislative authority of the State; and if it were given, rightly or wrongly—wrongly, if you please; I will not argue that point at the moment —if we did give a freehold tenure, as you said we did in 1904, as your Lord Chancellor said we did, as the lawyers then arguing from this side of the House said we did, by what vestige of right do you now come forward and take it away at the end of fourteen years? We have held a perfectly clear consistent view of this matter throughout. It is you who have changed, and in the very act of changing you have proved yourselves not only inconsistent in your views of property, but utterly unscrupulous in your method of dealing with it. I was amazed to hear the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down describe everything in the nature of what he called monopoly value as being, for that reason alone, the property of the State and not of the individual. I do not know how far he is going to press that view. I have no doubt he supported the Government three nights ago when they gave £23,500,000 for the docks of London avowedly not because the docks had a statutory right, but because they came to Parliament for authority and had spent a lot of money, and, whatever might be their actual commercial value at the moment, they had something which might properly be described as monopoly value which the State was proposing to acquire. I think other legislation might be quoted in which property has been dealt with in that way. You cannot deal in this airy fashion with something which you choose to say is monopoly value. Property which a man up to the present moment thinks he is the owner of, which he has bought and thinks he may be able to sell, and, whether he may be able to sell it or not, is certainly taxable, you cannot regard as anybody's property but his. By whatever process it was created, whether by law or by custom, so long as it be property, so long can there be no right to deal with it in the extraordinary loose fashion in which hon. Gentlemen opposite are prepared to deal with the property of the licence-owner. Holding, as they did, that it was made into a freehold four years ago, it cannot now be taken away at the end of fourteen years without compensation. Any hon. Gentleman who thinks over the pledges given and the character of the criticisms indulged in by members of the present Government four years ago, and the general course which this House has always followed in dealing with property, cannot but believe that the owners of licences are to be most abominably treated by the procedure proposed in this Bill. I would just add, in order to safeguard myself, one further comment upon the arguments that were used in 1904. I think it was said that the Government of the day had no right to pass the Bill of that year; they might, indeed, have been in a temporary majority in the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords——

AN HON. MEMBER: Not temporary in the House of Lords.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: They had the advantage, at all events, of being in a majority in both Houses; but although they had a majority of support in this House, it was said that they had not the moral approbation of the people behind them, and therefore their action was without validity. That argument was pressed again and again. I should hardly think it worth notice if it had not been pressed by very high authorities; but I mention it lest some hon. Gentleman following me in this debate may say that this freehold tenure, as the present Lord Chancellor defined it, was conferred by the Act of 1904 in a manner so grossly immoral that the legal action of Parliament carried with it no moral obligation on that Parliament's successors. I do not know whether anybody is bold enough to repeat that argument, which was then extremely familiar and popular. I rather think they will not repeat it, because, after all, the argument only amounts to this, that if a majority appeals to the nation on a particular question before it, the electors would give a different verdict to that which a majority of the House of Commons was prepared to give. That is what the argument must mean, and that being so I do not think any hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House is likely to appeal to it on the present occasion. I am sure that even the enthusiasm of the hon. Member for Lincoln does not so far blind him to the obvious facts of contemporary politics as to induce him to suppose that if he could appeal to the opinion of that part of the United Kingdom to which this Bill applies he would not find an overwhelming majority of the electors against him. I think I may leave both the legal argument of those who thought the Act of 1904 gave a freehold tenure and the ethico-political argument which said the Parliament of 1904 had no authority to pass the Act with the brief comments which I have passed upon them. I now should like to ask exactly what the Government think they gain or what temperance reform is going to gain by these additional seven years which they are giving as a boon to licence-holders, and how they justify their dealings with off-licences. As regards the first question, I should like to recall to the House the speech made a few minutes ago by the hon. Member for Lincoln. I have always been surprised that we have had held before us in so many speeches the happy moment when the nation will come again to its own and be able to deal unfettered and unhampered with all the problems of temperance. That period was coming at the end of fourteen years. It is now coming at the end of twenty-one years. I have always wished to know how those who think the millennium is then coming propose to use the freedom which is to be given by this Bill. I cannot be enthusiastic about a scheme of the nature of which I have not the smallest idea. Why should I believe that in the next fourteen years some panacea for our alcoholic excess is going to be discovered when none has been discovered in the past? Why should we legislate at the cost of enormous public controversy, much bitterness of spirit, and, as I think, gross injustice, in order that at some future time a reform of which we have not had given us even the most shadowy outline is going to be brought into being? I admit that, as far as the hon. Member for Lincoln is concerned, that criticism does not apply to him. He has a perfectly clear idea of it. It is going to be produced by two methods. When we reach perfection we shall have total prohibition. In the intermediate stage which is to lead up to total prohibition we are going to keep the licence-holder in a position of the greatest uncertainty as to the terms upon which and the period during which he is to be allowed to carry on his trade. We are told by the hon. Member that, next to prohibition, control is the real remedy, and by control he means insecurity, or, at all events, one side of the method by which the hon. Member wants control, as he himself will admit, is absolute insecurity for the man carrying on the trade of a licensee. I think that I do not misrepresent the hon. Member for Lincoln when I say so.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: That is exactly the system which the right hon. Gentleman devised for new licences in Clause 4 of the Act of 1904.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. He is under a great mistake. I believe that under the new system it is in their power to give a seven years term—security for seven years. What the hon. Gentleman wants is that a licence-holder should never know from year to year what is to happen. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] That is what he wants. The hon. Member for Lincoln is here and he can contradict me if I misrepresent him.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: As the right hon. Gentleman appeals to me, all I have to say is that I am quite content with the application of his system as devised under Clause 4 of the Act of 1904, subject to local option.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Subject to local option. I think now the hon. Gentleman who interrupted will feel that his interruption is uncalled for. That is exactly what the hon. Member for Lincoln wants. Under the provisions of the Act of 1904 a new licence was to be carried on with the securities which are essential to every kind of business, I do not care what it is. We were not so stupid as to provide that a man who was going to carry on business was to carry it on under conditions which made his whole trade and business in life absolutely insecure. Therefore, the hon. Member for Lincoln is not content with the provisions of the Act of 1904, but wishes them subject to local option, in other words that the community may by a two-thirds majority step in and take away from the licence holder the whole security under which he carries on his business. Therefore, that is temperance reform according to the hon. Member for Lincoln and those who think with him. They think that that is the condition of things we are to aim at until the time comes when we can have total prohibition. I am bound to say that with such an idea as that it surely was not worth while stirring up turmoil throughout the whole country and making vast classes believe that they are the subjects of the grossest injustice. How on earth are you going to improve the morals of the people in that way? The hon. Member said that every zealous temperance reformer throughout the world believes in total prohibition. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Local option."] Well, local option which involves prohibition. That is the thing which he and other temperance reformers believes in. I am sure the temperance reformers are a most zealous body of men, and I am sure they are prepared to make immense sacrifices, partly at their own expense and partly at that of others to carry out the objects which they most sincerely desire to see accomplished, but I think we must have some better ground for our belief than this—some more authoritative dictum than the mere statement of a particular class of reformers. We are justified in asking what grounds they have for anticipating all those admirable results for their particular nostrum. We have had this Bill now before us many days, we have had discussions upon the principles which lie at the root of it, but never yet has one speaker got up and given us an argued ground for thinking either that insecurity in the preliminary stage or prohibition in the final stage is going to do anything whatever to increase temperance in the community. The hon. Members stated that those who went to the State of Maine for a short time thought that prohibition was a bad thing, and that those who stayed there a long time thought it was a good thing. The people who think it is a bad thing are legion. He is the only one I have ever heard say that it is a good thing.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): A vote has been taken in several districts and has resulted in favour of prohibition.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said that people would not vote for prohibition. I said they would not be more temperate after they had voted for it. I think it is extremely likely that as the result of these local option clauses you will have districts in the country which will vote for total prohibition. Are they going to be the most temperate districts? [MINISTERIAL cries of "Yes."]

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I made a very long speech on the subject with which the right hon. Gentleman is dealing, and I did endeavour to justify the claim we confidently make that drinking and drunkenness are diminished in prohibition countries.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I regret that I was not in the House when the hon. Member made his speech. I am sure it was a very excellent speech and full of rich matter. Let us grant that most of us on both sides of the House approach this question through a mist of prejudice, but if you go outside those people who think it enough to have good intentions without showing how these good intentions are going to bear practical fruit, if you ask the opinion of those who simply look at the thing coldly and scientifically, and with an eye to discovering exactly the connection of cause and effect, so far as that difficult web can be disentangled in the social fabric, you will certainly not find unanimity for the contention of the hon. Gentleman. I do not think you will find a preponderance of opinion in favour of the hon. Gentleman. I greatly doubt whether you will find one man who takes the views of the hon. Member for Appleby and of the hon. Member for Lincoln. They, of course, are sincere. Let them go to the scientific observer and ask what he thinks of total prohibition in the United States or elsewhere, and I am perfectly convinced that they will come to the conclusion that the idea of preventing countries like England, Scotland, and Ireland from consuming alcohol is simply grotesque. I think public opinion is moving in that direction. I am a believer in the growth of temperance, but I am not a believer in the theory that you can ever hasten that growth by prohibiting alcohol altogether, or that the principle of local option is one that can be carried out at all. I appeal to those who think it can be carried out, and I ask hon. Members opposite how they can give utterances to the eulogies of this Bill which I hear from their lips day after day when I see in the very clause itself that the Government are determined not to give local option or any control whatever over the amount of alcoholic liquor to be sold by the possessors of off-licences. They will acquit me of wishing to make any personal attack, when I question the sincerity of the arguments which they are ever giving us for preventing the holders of on-licences from selling. No sacrifice is too great, no popularity which is not worth breaking as long as you are dealing with on-licences. When you come to off-licences a totally different theory comes into play. Is the alcohol sold by a grocer, consumed with no control, taken round in carts with the utmost convenience to every house over large areas, brought into the cottage to be within the reach of the wives, daughters and children of every householder in the country—is that to go on absolutely unchecked by the people who come before us and say that prohibition, and prohibition alone, is the final solution of this question? Are we seriously to be approached by hon. Gentlemen opposite and told that they are supporters of some great moral propaganda when on the face of their Bill there is this gross and scandalous inconsistency? I quite agree as to the difficulty of applying local option to off-licences, but I certainly thought for a moment that the Government had felt the gravity and difficulty of their position, and the impossibility of maintaining this amazing distinction between the brewer and the on-license holder on the one side, and the spirit seller and the off-licence holder on the other. I thought they recognised that the position could not be maintained when the First Commission of Works came down and proposed the Amendment embodied in the Bill we are discussing, but I discovered that he meant something quite different. He repudiated almost with horror that the Government were going to carry out this control with regard to off-licences. Therefore, I am again brought face to face with the two hon. Gentleman who interrupted me and who come before us, telling us that all temperance reformers throughout the world are in favour of prohibition, and believe in prohibition and restriction alone. I find them voting with enthusiasm for a clause which leaves the greatest of all evils absolutely untouched—drinking at home, drinking under circumstances where there is no control, and where, at all events, it is the source of some of the evils in connection with the intemperance among the women of the land which, I hope untruly, is said to be an increasing scourge in the community.

*MR. LEIF JONES: Although I shall vote for the clause without off-licences in it, I should vote much more willingly for it if it included off-licences. It is no fault of mine that they have been excluded.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Really I cannot accept the apology of the hon. Gentleman for the course he has taken on this occasion. He goes about saying that this is a great temperance reform, but I say that it is absurd to call it a temperance reform if you hold that the proper method is restriction first and prohibition afterwards, while in regard to the places where it should have its best and most salutary effect the Bill does not operate. I do not know that I have any other question to ask the Government; but I hope that they will state their general position with regard to property in licences, and that they will reconcile their statements about the Act of 1904 with the legislation they are now proposing. The second question which I ask is how they reconcile their belief in the policy of restriction and prohibition with the unrestricted scope which they are now giving to off-licences under this clause, and the position in which they have left the clubs in the latter part of the Bill. Many of the arguments I have used with regard to off-licences might be used with regard to clubs, but I should be content now if they give a complete answer with regard to off-licences. Until they first answer the question of property, remembering what they themselves said, and what their highest legal authorities said three years ago, and how they reconcile their treatment of the off-licences with their treatment of the on-licences, I think, for the first time, some genuine justification should be given to the House of the extraordinary measure now before it.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Cleveland): The right hon. Gentleman began his speech by saying that no Member of the Government had risen to explain the purpose and meaning of this clause. This clause was discussed in Committee for no less than two days and a half, and all the Amendments now on the Paper in the name of the Government are the outcome of those discussions, and the results of pledges then given. There is nothing that is novel for the Government to explain. And if I may very respectfully say so, the right hon. Gentleman in his interesting speech has given us nothing that is novel to reply to. He did, however, make use of one argument that is new, an argument, indeed, of a very extraordinary character. He says that, although he himself holds the opinion, and has always held it, that licences are not freehold property, and although the Act of 1904, in his opinion, did not make them freehold property, yet that we, because we said in the discussions in 1904 that to accept that Bill would be practically to constitute them a freehold tenure, we forsooth are bound to regard them with all the respect due to a legally constituted freehold property. If we are bound by those discussions to anything at all, we are bound to repeal the essential principle of that Bill. The right hon. Gentleman says we may advance the argument that that Act is based on no sound basis, because it was passed without a mandate from the people, and without the sanction of the electorate; and he asserted very emphatically and confidently that if the present Bill were put to the judgment of any body of persons affected by it you would find an overwhelming majority condemning its principles. I have had the figures of the bye-elections in England and Wales, excluding Scotland, very carefully examined since this Bill was introduced, and it would perhaps surprise the right hon. Gentleman to learn that there has been a majority of voters who have declared their opinion in support of this measure and that only a minority voted against it. The right hon. Gentleman forgets that all the Socialist and Labour candidates who have come before the country in recent bye-elections have been without a single exception supporters of the principle of the Bill. [An HON. MEMBER on the OPPOSITION benches: "A very valuable precedent."] And although it may be the case that owing to split candidatures some seats have been lost, the contention of the right hon. Gentleman that a very considerable majority would have been found voting against the Bill has been absolutely falsified by the facts. The main question which has been raised by the right hon. Gentleman and by other speakers turns on the question of the nature of the possession of the licence; what degree of ownership attaches to the person who holds a licence. The right hon. Gentleman admits that it is not equivalent to a freehold property, and that very fact falsifies the whole basis of the argument on which much of the opposition to this Bill rests—the argument which rests on the assumption that this Bill can be taken as a precedent for dealing with any other kind of property—that what you are doing to-day with regard to licences you may do to-morrow with regard to railways, land, or any other form of property. The right hon. Gentleman has admitted that this form of property stands on a completely different footing from any other form of property. [OPPOSITION cries of "No, no."]

*MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought I emphasised the fact that a vast amount of property in this country is other than freehold. Similarly you have no more right to deal with this than with other kinds of property without giving compensation.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: What other kinds of property are there that rest on a basis of an annual licence from the State, which can be recalled by the public authority? The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that although a licence was not in the nature of a freehold property, it is nevertheless property of a kind that is taxed, and which a man can buy and which a man can sell, and which consequently belongs to him. Surely, holding that doctrine, the corollary to be drawn from it and which has been drawn to-day by the hon. Member for York, is that if you want to suppress these licences as honest men you must pay for them. [OPPOSITION cheers.] Hon. Members opposite share that view. How then can they support or even acquiesce in the continuance of the Act of 1904 passed by the action of a Conservative Government holding that doctrine of property? Under it year by year hundreds of licences throughout the country are being suppressed.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): They are paying the market value.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: They are not paying a sixpence. The money is drawn from the pockets of the owners of the "property" to compensate them for the loss of the licence. Would the right hon. Gentleman or any of his supporters venture to say that they could for a moment in this House propose a similar action with regard to railways, land, or any other property; that they could tax the owners to form a special fund to compensate them for that which was taken away? That argument has been stated again and again by the Prime Minister and it has never been answered, because it is unanswerable. All that remains is the proof, conclusively given I admit to-day again and again, that there was an expectation of a renewal of the licence. That has never been denied. Speeches have been made showing that these men have received year by year their licences by a renewal which was little more than formal, and that they bought and sold these houses—all which goes to show that there had been an expectation of renewal, not a legal right. Licences were taken away by hundreds in 1903 and in previous years by the justices without a single sixpence of compensation being paid from any quarter. It was because the justices took away these licences by the hundred and for no other reason than that they were not wanted, without compensation, that the licence-holders went to the right hon. Gentleman and asked him to pass the Act of 1904 in order that they might have a measure of security which they did not then enjoy. They have proved that there was an expectation of renewal. Of course, there was an expectation of renewal, and it is because of that that we allow this long time limit. If there were no expectation of renewal all those licences the reduction of these 30,000 licences could be effected to-day, and the monopoly value of the rest could be taken to-morrow. It is because of this modified and very limited form of possession that we allow this long period to elapse before we resume the monopoly value which we consider to be the just right of the State. Assuming, then, that there is nothing more than an expectation, that there is no freehold property in the licence, do hon. Gentlemen opposite declare that that expectation can never be terminated by a time-limit? If they assert that it can never be so terminated, then they reckon this form of property on a very different basis from that on which they admit it rests, and they establish it on the same footing as forms of freehold property. I would like to quote to the House a few words from a speech of the Leader of the Opposition in Committee stage, which stated very clearly his view of the possibility of a time-limit, and brings into clear relief and sharp contradiction the views which he held on this matter, and those held by the great majority of Members who sit behind him. The Prime Minister quoted the speech of the right hon. Gentleman on the First Reading in which he had asserted that a licence is not in the nature of a freehold property; and in reply to that the right hon. Gentleman used these words:—

> "Anybody who listened to the quotation the right hon. Gentleman read a few minutes ago will see that was my opinion on the First Reading of the Bill. It was my opinion then. It has been the same in the interval, and it remains my opinion now. We have to deal with a genuine form of property which is less than a freehold tenure. I am not here concerned to deny that if you are dealing with a form of property which is less than a freehold tenure you may imagine a term of years, after which you may say to these people, 'Your rights, which are less than freehold, are now exhausted.' I do not deny that. What I deny is that you have the smallest right to compel these people to pay compensation during a period of years to those whose licences are withdrawn, and then at the end of the term of years, after they had been paying this compensation steadily and patiently, allow their property to be taken away."

Now let the House mark to what a narrow issue the controversy is contracted. The right hon. Gentleman agrees that a time-limit without a compensation levy may perhaps be right; he does not deny that such a time-limit unaccompanied with a compensation levy may be justifiable, but he says that a time-limit accompanied by a compensation levy must be wrong. That is the right hon. Gentleman's position clearly and definitely stated on the Committee stage. I think we have a right to assume that that is his position now. But why, if the time-limit may be right itself, should it necessarily be wrong to accompany it for some portion of the time or the whole time by a compensation levy? We come here to the question of the comparative burden on the trader, and the question resolves itself into the length of the time-limit, and whether it shall be accompanied by a compensation levy, and, if so, during what period of the time-limit shall it be imposed. The right hon. Gentleman admits that a lime-limit of, say, fourteen years—though I do not tie him to that—may be right, but that a time-limit such as the Government proposes, twenty-one years, of which seven are to be free from compensation levy, must clearly be wrong. I am quite unable to follow that course of argument. I cannot see upon what kind of principle the right hon. Gentleman can argue for the rejection of the clause as a whole, and why he should not come to the House and say, extend to sufficient length the limit and the levy to a sufficiently few number of years, and there is no objection to the time-limit.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: You do not extend it—I do not want to interrupt or to go into details—the right hon. Gentleman does not give what he pretends he is giving; it is not seven years fixity of tenure.

***MR. HERBERT SAMUEL**: Then let the right hon. Gentleman say, if he will —it is matter, no doubt, for discussion— if the seven years are extended to fourteen years with exemption from levy, will he then withdraw his opposition to this clause.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course not.

***Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL**: He says of course not.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course not. [Laughter.] This is a matter of argument, and, I presume to be treated seriously. My opinion is perfectly clear, and I have explained it. You can imagine a time-limit—I do not say what limit—in which dealing with what is less than freehold tenure—I do not deny you might give a perfectly clear, untouched tenure for an explicit length of time, and that might be regarded as adequate compensation, but the idea that seven years is a sufficient period is unreasonable.

***Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL**: What, then, becomes of all the arguments used by hon. Gentlemen on the other side to show it is "monstrous robbery" to put any term upon the existence of a licence, to fix any period, however brief or however long, at the end of which the monopoly value shall be taken? What becomes of the Ten Commandments argument?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said that. [Cries of "Who said it?"]

***Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL**: Every one of the hon. Gentlemen behind the right hon. Gentleman, almost every opponent of the Bill who has spoken against it on public platforms, has declared it is "monstrous robbery" to take away from men who have bought their licences out of their own pockets, who have been taxed upon their value for the death duties and the income-tax—to take away the licences at the end of a period, however long, without paying the full market value of those licences. The right hon. Gentleman does not hold that view, he holds that if the time-limit is sufficiently long and sufficiently free from burdens on the trade then it will not be a matter of injustice. The period of years must be a question of opinion, of difference perhaps according to the standpoint from which the subject is approached. The Government believe the seven years proposed in the Minority Report of the Peel Commission is unduly rigorous, that fourteen years will be just, and that twenty-one years will be generous; and especially as it is now made clear that monopoly value is narrowly defined and does not include the publican's goodwill, and only includes what Members opposite have contended is small—the difference between Schedule A on the premises licensed and Schedule A on the premises not licensed. It is necessary for the State at the end of the time-limit to resume the monopoly value, and, as the hon. Member for Lincoln has shown, it is necessary that the expectation should not grow up again. It is necessary for that reason alone, apart from financial reasons, to secure that the State shall resume this monopoly value. The right hon. Gentleman put a question as to off-licences. It is a question that was argued in Committee, and I was able then to quote the words of the late Solicitor-General stating the view of himself and his colleagues, that off-licences are on a completely different footing from on-licences. I adhere to that opinion, they are very different, different in their nature, different in the degree of temptation they offer, and they cannot be regarded as being on the same footing. That is the view of the Government. It was not intended, at any stage, as the First Commissioner of Works has said, to do more than at the end of the time-limit to take the monopoly value. That question will arise on Clause 5, and in order that it may be fully discussed the Government in the closure Resolution have placed Clause 5 first in the compartment that will be reached in forty minutes from now, and for that reason I will leave further discussion for the present. Two or three small points have been raised by hon. Members. The hon. Member for Kidderminster has dealt with the grouping of small parishes, and asked why, in regard to local option under this clause and also in regard to Clause 2, small parishes have not been grouped.

Mr. BARNARD said he did not object to Clause 2; he asked about Clause 3.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The question of small parishes arises under this clause, which applies the machinery of Clause 2. It has been carefully considered by the Government, and, on the whole, we think the better course will be not to attempt a system of grouping. The parishes often do not adjoin. The creating for local option of artificial areas made up of parishes from different parts of the county will not be practicable. If the small parish were attached to a larger parish adjoining the effect of the voting would not perhaps be in accordance with public opinion in the small parish.

MR. BARNARD: Then you adhere to the parish?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Yes; we adhere to the parish. The hon. Member referred to a parish with only seven inhabitants; he did not say how many public-houses there are in that parish, perhaps not one, and certainly there will not be an application for a new licence there.

MR. BARNARD said in such a parish with local option one or two persons might have the power to prevent the issue of a licence or to get rid of one.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I do not think there is any question upon which it will be more fitting for even the smallest local governing area to express its opinion. If they are not consumers I do not see why they should be compelled to have a public-house in their midst. A further question has been raised by the hon. Member for Worcestershire of the postponement of the operation of local option to the end of twenty-one years. The Government are not disposed to adopt that course; it will be to defer means of reform, to which we attach considerable importance, and there cannot be any objection to it from the thd right hon. Gentlemen opposite who says he cannot conceive a majority of two-thirds will ever be obtained to put the provision into force. Then the hon. Gentleman argued that preference should be given to existing licence-holders, but I think they can well trust their interests to the sense of fairness of the justices of the place, and there can be but little doubt that where a licence is continued, under ordinary circumstances and in the absence of special reason to the contrary, it will be continued to the persons who now hold the public-house.

The issue raised by the clause is clear, whether the just right of the State is to prevail over private interests not founded on law and which cannot be proved to be founded on justice. In this, as in other matters, there are fewer than there should be to support the public interest. Even among Members of Parliament, even among those who have had charge of national concerns and whose primary duty it should be to safeguard the interests of the State, private interests have many eager adherents, but it is the privilege of the Government to stand for the principle that the State has the right to resume the value it has itself created.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said the right hon. Gentleman concluded with a peroration which began, so far as he could recollect, somewhat in this way: "The question for this House is whether the just right of the State is to prevail," but when he was at school that would be known as an instance of the practice of question begging, the whole point they were there to discuss being whether or not the particular proposals which were engaging the attention of the House were just and right. He proposed once again to deal with that question, and to comment upon the amusing travesty of the opinions of his right hon. friend, which the right hon. Gentleman was never tired of presenting to this House. His right hon. friend said that he could conceive a period of years which might be so extended in character that if during that period the compensation levy were not to be made it might be unobjectionable. There was not a Member of the Opposition who did not assent to the view of his right hon. friend. If a sufficient period of years was given there could be no grievance. He knew not what the period of years might be. If a man who wished to put his licence on the market could say he was secured for forty years, and on an actual calculation that was equivalent to the market value, he held then there was nothing to be said against. But by so much as it fell short of the market value it was confiscation pure and simple.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: Does the hon. Member mean that even if no money was paid at the end of the period a licence might be taken away?

Mr. F. E. SMITH said that if the licensee to-day had a licence and he was secure in the possession of it for a period, he had the market value. What it was he did not know. He had conducted many cases, but it was entirely a question for the actuaries as to the number of years. There was no difference of opinion between hon. Members on the abstract question of the time-limit. They were all in favour of a time-limit if it meant market value. What the Opposition objected to was this clumsy device. In dealing with compensation cases and the value of the ante-1869 licences and other licences, a clear distinction had always been recognised by expert valuers who had given evidence, by arbitrators, and by the Judges. When the Law Officers of the then Government were arguing the question of market value before Mr. Justice Kennedy, not only was it said that market value should be paid, but their own witnesses said so. But the Prime Minister had since alluded to the "fundamental vice of the judgment," though he did not say that the learned Judge had made a mistake. It was now said that the law which the learned Judge interpreted correctly was one which the Government did not admit. They thought it ought not to be the law. If to-day a licence was required by the London County Council for a municipal purpose, say, in the Strand, and they were going to suppress it, market value was paid; but if the House of Commons took away that same licence for a national purpose, they were not to allow the trade to compensate themselves for that market value. That was an inconsistency which both the House and the country had been very carefully regarding and the time was coming when an explanation would have to be given. The Under-Secretary for the Home Department had dealt with the distinction between off-licences and on-licences, so far as those proposals were concerned, by saying that the Solicitor-General had covered the point in a previous speech. It had, however, hardly required so acute an observer as the Solicitor-General to place the great and obvious distinction before the House. Nobody had yet said what the difference was from the point of view of testing the adequacy and honesty of the Government's proposals. Nobody had been bold enough to get up in the House and say there was the slightest distinction between the sale of beer and the sale of spirits, so far as the mischievous consequences of undue facilities was concerned. If there was no difference between those facilities, why was not the Government giving the advantage of its reforming proposals to the off-licences. Statistics had been quoted, and much had been said as to the feeling in the country as shown by the bye-elections. He hoped that before very long the Government would be given an opportunity of testing the opinion of the country, not at bye-elections, but at a general election. If that opportunity was afforded—and there were many who hoped and believed that it would be afforded at an early date—the Government would be provided with statistics more general in their origin, and of more value than any they had put forward.

*Mr. SIMON (Essex, Walthamstow) said that from the speech just made by the hon. and learned Member opposite he should judge that many of those who sat with the hon. Member must feel very glad that he was not in the House at the time of the passing of the 1904 Act. He had laid down a proposition which proved, if it proved anything, that the authors of the Act of 1904 had perpetrated a monstrous injustice in that measure. The view of the hon. Member was that the licence owner who had his house taken away in the public interest must always, so long as justice was justice, be compensated at its full market value by the community. He understood that the view of hon. Members opposite was that the Act of 1904 did not confer on the licence-holder any rights which he was not already entitled to; that that Act was not a favour to promote the interests of the licence holder, but was to do him full justice and to secure him in the position he was entitled to hold. The Act provided that if a licence was to be taken away, by the discretion of the magistrates and for no fault of the holder, he was to be compensated. But he would point out that the right given was that the licence holder was to be compensated, not at the expense of the community, but at the expense of his fellow-sufferers, who in their turn were to have their licences extinguished, but from whom, in the meantime, the compensation was collected. He thought, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the late Government were cordially to be congratulated on the absence of the hon. and learned Member in the last Parliament for he could not possibly have supported their Act of 1904. There were two distinct questions connected with the time-limit. Ought they, or ought they not, to admit the justice of a time-limit in principle, and ought they to agree that the particular time-limit proposed was a fair one which could be justified? He could not help thinking the hon. and learned Member opposite had confused the two parts of this inquiry. The Leader of the Opposition said it might be all right to suppress in a given number of years a licence, because it was not wanted, if there was no compensation levy, but it became all wrong if there was a compensation levy to pay as well. Did hon. Gentlemen opposite think that this Bill would be improved by a trifling change which some of them would not be unwilling to see? Let them stop compensation from that moment, and let them leave the time-limit where it was. He did not imagine that that would satisfy hon. Gentlemen opposite. If he followed what had been advanced in the later stages of the debate, it was contended that it was adding insult to injury that they should both collect and distribute the compensation levy on the one hand, and suppress licences in a given number of years on the other. If there were two wrongs, both pressing hardly on this persecuted class, then let them get rid of one of them. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite knew very well that the whole scheme of compensation set up by the late Government was a scheme which was intended to inure to the advantage of publicans and brewers. But they must accept, at any rate in some degree, that what was done, was done, and it might well be, the Act of 1904 once having been passed, even though passed in defiance of public opinion, that the situation was not the same, and that the slate was not quite so clean as it was before the right hon. Gentleman opposite began to write on it: "Compensation to brewers." While that was so, they were entitled, not in any private interest, but in the national interest, to say that they could amend the existing law by the wise provisions of this Bill and could see that a time-limit was put upon a conflict which, after all, was a conflict between private interests and public interests. There was no part of the Bill which more clearly commended itself to those who were followers, and proud to call themselves followers, of the Government. There was no part of the Bill, he believed, which more clearly represented the opinions of independent people throughout the country. There was no part of the Bill which more clearly showed that the real conflict was between the claim of a select class on the one hand, who had got a great monopoly at the expense of the community to exploit the community, and the claim of the community itself on the other, to see that that which belonged to it was restored to it within a reasonable time.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said the hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken of a select class of people, but he would like to put a question which he had asked before, and which had not been answered. There had been discussions between clever lawyers raising nice points, but the question which he had to ask put the matter in the way in which the country would regard it. He had already mentioned, by way of illustration, the case of a man who had invested his savings in brewery shares. He was a small tradesman with whom he had been in communication, and he knew his statements to be correct. That man was getting about 6 per cent. on his investment. If he put by his dividends and invested them in a sinking fund at 3¼ per cent. he would at the end of fourteen years have just got back his money invested in the brewery shares. But supposing, as he was entitled to do, he used his annual dividends, then, at the end of fourteen years, he would have lost every penny of his investment. The country would approach the matter from the point of view of this case. What answer could be given to it on the public platform? Tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of small people made these investments. It was not merely a case of the big brewers with which they were dealing. The case he had mentioned showed the line of argument which would be taken by the people at the general election, which he was afraid was not so near as some of his hon. friends thought, because the Government were afraid to put this question before the public. The country had made up its mind already. But the question would have to be answered why these investors of small sums, say of £200 or so in brewery shares, which, from what had gone before, they were led to believe were safe investments and recognised by the community as such were to be reduced to beggary. The only answer which had been given was that by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Spen Valley, who said that these investors ought to have known that it was a precarious stock. These men had invested honestly earned savings, of which every penny, under this Bill, would disappear. He wanted a straightforward answer to his question.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 261; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 381.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)

Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morse, L. L.
Murray, Capt. Hn A C. (Kincard)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc)
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain

Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walker, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, Mr. Speaker proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words 'licence whether an.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 3 2.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J.T. (Chesh.)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.

Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray,CaptHn.A.C.(Kincard)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W. H. M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)

Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
PriestleyW.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rodgers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury

Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. de R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn (C'rmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner. John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clive, Percy Archer
Clough, William
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd

Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, W. E.(Bury S. Edm.)
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John

Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A. R.
Long,Col.Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James

Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 19, to leave out the words, 'or an off-licence.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 232 ; Noes, 134. (Division List No. 383.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,CH(Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt,Rt.Hd.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert,Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morgan,J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H.J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt. Hn. E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White,J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beach,Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A (Worc.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Rea,WalterRussell (Scarboro'
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Schwann,SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh)
Steadman, W. C.

Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker,Col.W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 24, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that until the expiration of seven years after the termination of the reduction period there shall be no power to attach to the re-grant of an old on-licence any condition for securing to the public the monopoly value of the licence.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 270 ; Noes, 29. (Division List No. 384.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clive, Percy Archer
Cobbold, Felix Thornley

Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Ernest
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston
Guinness,W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harris, Frederick Leverton

Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kerry, Earl of
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, Sir George

M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, SirRobertJ. (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Randles,Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock,Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs,N.W.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. de R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Barnes, G. N.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Crooks, William
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Glover, Thomas
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Lamont, Norman
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robinson, S.
Rutherford,W. W. (Liverpool)
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Vivian, Henry
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Howard.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 26, at the end, to insert the words 'shall not be applicable to off-licences and.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 234; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 385.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Actland (Chrischurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt

Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Camley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew,W.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, Col. SirIvor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.)
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. HnA.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W. H. M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E.(Edinburhg, Central
Price,Sir RobertJ. (Norfolk, E
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Roberston,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas S
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J. Spicer.
Spicer Sir, Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Sailsbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beach,Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil,Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A.(Worc
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig,Captain James(Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness,W.E.(Bury S. Edm.)
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt-.Col. A.R.
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Oddy, John James
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Franics Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberst, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Steadman, W. C.
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 30, to leave out Paragraph (*b*) of subsection (2) of Clause 3.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 265; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 386.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, A. Joseph (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander

Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHnSir W. Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil Wiliam
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir RobertJ.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn.Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn. J.(Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Ferderick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A. R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lupton, Arnold
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill,Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 15, to leave out the words 'Subject to the foregoing provision,' and to insert the words 'Except as provided by this section with respect to the limitation of optional reduction by the financial provisions of this Act and the exclusion of appeal in the case of a licence extinguished in pursuance of a scheme for statutory reduction.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 387.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howe (Bristol,S.
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)

Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale)
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford. G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hon, A, Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G.R. Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius

Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.)Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness,Hon.R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. Windsor
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir Joseph Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,F. E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill,Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out the words 'an old on-licence,' and to insert the words 'all old on-licences.'"

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 18, to leave out the words 'have for the time being with respect to other on-licences,' and to insert the words 'had with respect to the renewal or transfer of alehouse licences before the passing of the Licensing Act, 1904."—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 251 ; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 388.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J.H(York, Otley)
Duncan, J. H.(York, Otley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)

Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam,James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard,Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk,B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir RobertJ. (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert J. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt.HnE.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,,RtHn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clive, Percy Archer
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John

Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

*The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): I beg to move the Amendment which stands in the name of my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General in order to make it clear what was the original intention of the Government with regard to "off-licences." The intention was unfortunately confused in the mind of the House owing to the error by which my Amendment was put down in Clause 3. They were in fact the wrong words in the wrong place, and for that I accept the entire responsibility, but I am happy to say that the minimum of inconvenience was caused either to the House or to the public outside, because I was able on the following day, owing to the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, to make an interruption in one of his speeches, and was able to explain at once what really the intention of the Government was. As Clause 5 originally stood, and as it stands to-day in this Bill, it secures that monopoly value shall be taken of all new off-licences. I think it is obviously desirable that we should take the same monopoly value for old off-licences after the period of twenty-one years time-limit at the same time that we are dealing with monopoly value for old on-licences. I think it is admitted that off-licences have no monopoly value now. ["Yes."] The amount is so infinitesimal that it cannot really be disputed that there is practically no monopoly value now. But if a larger monopoly value is to be created by the operation of other sections of this Bill in the future, it is very desirable that we should give a warning at once to those people to whom it might accrue that they will not in future be allowed to retain it. This Amendment will serve as a notice which will prevent the growth as regards off-licences in the future of any of those expectations which are less than a freehold but which are yet a "sacred right." I am sure that none of us wish to see the growth in the future of any of these sacred or profane rights. The late Government did their best to ensure that there should be no growth of an expectation on the part of off-licences, because in the Bill of 1904, although they were limiting the discretion of the justices in other directions, they left the licensing justices full powers to deal as they thought fit with off-licences. In spite of the fact that the magistrates' discretion was left unfettered the late Government did not think it necessary to provide any compensation for off-licences that were removed, and, of course, no compensation levy was imposed upon them.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 36, at the end, to insert—(2) On the expiration of a period of seven years after the termination of the reduction period any powers under the Licensing Acts for the purpose of securing to the public the monopoly value of an off-licence may be exercised on the renewal of an off-licence in the same manner as they may be exercised on the grant of a new on-licence."—(*Mr. L. Harcourt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the position of the Government with regard to off-licences was a distinctly curious one. He had no desire to quarrel with the proposal now put forward, but merely wished to draw attention to the difference of the treatment accorded to off-licences and on-licences. Undoubtedly, on a previous occasion the House did distinctly vote that off-licences should be subject to the same conditions as on-licences, and yet now they were told that that was all a mistake on the part of the Government. This evening they had voted in exactly the opposite direction and the House had stultified itself, the only consistent Members being the Opposition and those few Members opposite who voted with them. They did not wish to penalise the grocer and say that he ought to be penalised as against other traders, but they did say that there ought to be equality of treatment dealt out as between one form of licence and another, and the result of this undue favouring of one particular class of the trade would be that drinking would be driven from the open light of day into the home. Nobody who cared for temperance could desire to see that.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) did not hesitate to say that while many portions of this Bill were rather difficult for the ordinary elector to follow, the point raised by this Amendment was one which was readily appreciated by the public. He had no hesitation in saying that the differential treatment between the publican and the grocer was a simple aspect of the Bill which was eagerly seized upon by ordinary people and was made a test as to the sincerity of those who brought in the Bill. What he would like to know was why should there be any distinction made under the Bill or for the purposes of the Bill, between a man who sold drink for consumption on one side of the door, and another who sold it for consumption on the other side. They were both drink-sellers. The Government were challenged to put the grocer and the publican upon a level; they agreed to do so, and they introduced into Clause 3 an Amendment in the most pointed terms which struck out the word "on-licence" and substituted the words "licence, whether on or off." The Government had said that when they enacted that grocers' licences were on renewal after a certain period to be deemed new licences in the same way as publicans' licences were to be deemed new licences they did not understand that the incidents of new licences would attach to grocers' licences. However profound might have been the ignorance of the Government on the main outstanding features of the Bill, that ignorance was not shared by a large number of their followers who were authorities on the matter, and the Amendment in a very full House was carried *nem. con.* They deliberately voted that grocers and publicans should be placed upon a level. They were put into the prison-house together, and were in equal case. But within forty-eight hours the Liberal Party were at the door of the prison-house, and, with every sign of agitation and contrition, had fetched out the grocer and left the publican where he was. What had happened in that short space of time? The publican and the grocer had been put on an equality as regards the disqualification of new licences, and the restrictive conditions and local veto. But the Government had decided to relieve the grocer, and had made the most complete amends to him. They had provided that although the publican's licence was to become a new licence at the expiration of a certain time with all the disadvantages that that entailed, the grocer's licence was not. He asked the Government, if they stood by the two principles of the desirability of reduction of facilities and of local control, on what ground did they apply those things to the publican and not to the grocer? In regard to this particular Amendment, when they came to exact the monopoly value it was not much to do, since they were told that there was none; but it was a most notable thing that the grocer was not put on the same basis as the publican. In the case of the publican, under the Act of 1904 the justices had no discretion, but were expressly enjoined that they must exact the monopoly value. Why was the grocer to have a chance to escape when the publican had no chance? It was being said in the country that the Government had surrendered in this matter to members of a powerful liquor interest. Of course it must not be forgotten that while there was a powerful liquor interest in the publican, there was also a powerful liquor interest in the grocer. It was being asked why, if the Government were sincere in these provisions, they were unwilling to apply to these sellers of drink who were sometimes said to be friendly to them the same scale and measure that they applied to those who were said to be their foes? What ground or principle was there for this differentiation between one drink seller and another, and especially what reason was there for this distinction between compelling justices to exact compensation in the one case and giving them a discretion in the other?

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he did not agree with one of his hon. friends behind him that there was no particular monopoly value in the case of these licences. He entirely agreed that that was practically the case at the present time, but this Amendment was intended to deal with the position as it would be on the expiry of the twenty-one years, which they had been dealing with under Clause 3. The First Commissioner of Works and the Solicitor-General knew perfectly well that by relieving the off-licence from the risks which the on-licence holder would have to face under local veto they must inevitably considerably add to whatever monopoly value was caused, and having created that monopoly value by that special exemption, they very naturally supposed that they should get a proper share of it. He would like to know the meaning of the addition to the clause of the words "may be exercised." His hon. and learned friend behind him had dealt with the peculiar fact that the word "may" was used in the clause and not the word "shall." No doubt the Solicitor-General would explain how these powers were to be permissive and not mandatory. But beyond and above all that therewas another point which appeared to arise out of the general wording of the Amendment, in regard to the words "any powers under the Licensing Acts." What did that mean? Did it mean powers given under the Bill with which they were now dealing, or did it include powers given under Section 4 of the Act of 1904? If that were so it opened the door also to differentiation in the manner of estimating the monopoly value as between the off-licence holder and the on-licence holder. In the case of the on-licence holder the monopoly value under the proposals of the Government differed very considerably, at all events, from that under the Act of 1904, which dealt with new licences only. They had not put any Amendment down, but they might bring one forward, because they thought the clause ought to be mandatory and not permissive.

SIR S. EVANS: In reply to the hon. Member for Basingstoke I have to say that although we shall be able to show that there is a great difference between off-licences and on-licences, yet I think that it will not be in order here to go into detail on that question. I may, however, touch upon some of the differences which have been pointed out not only in this debate but in some of the debates of 1904. Off-licences were not dealt with specially in the Act of 1904, and it was pointed out that they could not be dealt with conveniently under that measure, on the ground that they were not subject to the compensation levy. It was pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University that these off-licences were put on a wholly different footing from the ordinary on-licences dealt with under the Act of 1904. On the 15th June the right hon. Gentleman said that the question of off-licences was absolutely different from that of on-licences. They differed in essential points. There had been various alterations of the law with regard to off-licences, but when the grocer's licence was put on a different footing no question of compensation was raised. The right hon. Gentleman added that, if he remembered rightly, there were various points of difference, such as that the licence for the sale of beer and spirits attached to the person and not to the premises. Again, in the debate which took place on the same Bill on 8th June, 1904, upon an Amendment moved by a supporter of the Government to strike out the word "on" so that the provision could apply to off-licences, the then Solicitor-General said it was evident to anyone who understood the law that the Government could not accept the Amendment in that form. It included an immense number of off-licences, of which there were fourteen different kinds, and it would be impossible to apply the Bill to off-beer licences. I am not going into the history of these off-licences, but as the House is well aware the *status* of the off-beer licence up to 1882, to all intents and purposes, was freehold. With regard to other off-licences, that was also the *status* of wine and spirit off-licences, up to the year when Mr. Ritchie brought them under the full and absolute discretion of the justices, excepting with regard to persons then holding the licence. That being so, it did not appear to be right and fair that the bargain which was made in that way in 1902 should be brought under the local option clauses of this Bill. As I pointed out they could not be brought under the compensation clauses, and there is no reason why they should be brought under the local option clauses of this Bill during the existence of the present holders of the licence. What we have done is this. When we deal with the question of the monopoly value with regard to the new off-licences being entirely in the discretion of the justices to deal with, we think that the justices "may," which I think in this case means "shall," apply the same provision as to monopoly value in the case of the renewal of an off-licence as they apply to the granting of new on-licences. It follows that at the expiration of the reduction period, plus the seven years, that is to say twenty-one years, the provisions with reference to monopoly value shall be applicable to the renewal of off-licences just as they shall be applicable to the renewal of on-licences. That is shortly the general position of the Government with regard to this matter. Now I come to the questions put by the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs. I think the word "may," in the Amendment moved by my right hon. friend means "shall." Under the Act of 1904, Section 4, which deals with the various conditions which might be attached to the granting of a licence, it says that the justices in granting a licence may attach conditions as to payments to be made, suitability of the premises, management, and so on. That section gives them the power to attach these conditions subject to the remaining part of the section as to the conditions under which they get the monopoly value.

MR. YOUNGER asked whether the condition as to value was not altogether of a different kind.

SIR S. EVANS: If the words had been "the powers in the Licensing Acts should apply to off-licences as well as on-licences," there would be no question at all on the matter, but the intention is the same. If the hon. Member would like to insert "shall" instead of "may," I should accept it with pleasure, so as to make it perfectly clear. The intention is certainly to apply to these new off-licences the same provisions in regard to monopoly value as are applicable under Section 11 of the Act of 1904. That would make "may" mean "shall," but there ought to be no doubt about it. There is no question about the meaning, and it would make it clearer to substitute "shall" for "may." The hon. Member asked me what was the meaning of the words "any power under the Licensing Acts for the purpose." I do not know whether he remembers Clause 43 of this Bill which defines the expression "Licensing Acts" in this way—

> "The expression 'Licensing Acts' means the Licensing Acts 1826 to 1906 and this Act."

Now the hon. Member says if that be so, is there not a difference between the section of the Act of 1904 with reference to the basis upon which the monopoly value is to be ascertained and the provisions of this Act. That is not so, because the basis of the monopoly value under Section 4 of the Act of 1904 is repealed by this Bill. From the words "monopoly value" down to the words "taken into consideration" is repealed. These are the words which are repealed—

> "which is represented by the difference between the value the premises will bear in the opinion of the justices when licensed and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed."

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the basis for the fixing of the monopoly value under Section 4 of the Act of 1904 will be the basis under this Bill, and that will be applicable in the same way to new off-licences, and to the renewal of off-licences in twenty-one years as in the case of a new on-licence.

MR. YOUNGER asked how, if the definition of monopoly value in the Act of 1904 was repealed, the monopoly value of the new licence was to be defined in future. Was it to be under this Bill? And was the definition of monopoly value of a new licence to be granted under a new Bill to be the definition applying to old licences at the end of the period, because, if so, it was very different from the Act of 1904.

SIR S. EVANS: The hon. Member will see that on page 37 of the Bill as amended in Committee, line 34, Section 4, from the words "which is represented" down to "taken into consideration" is repealed and the words are those which I read a short time ago.

*MR. GRETTON said he had handed in a manuscript Amendment for the very purpose of making clear the intention of the Government that the authorities should secure monopoly value, and that it should not be a matter left to their discretion. He thought these words were really entirely necessary, because of the remarkable variation which the Bill represented with this Amendment as now drafted and the other part of the Bill. There was no doubt whatsoever as to what was to be done in the case of the on-licences. The Act of 1904 was referred to in specific terms. But in the case of the off-licences, and in the case of this Amendment as it stood there was no such reference. The whole Amendment on the Paper in this particular was vague and open to argument and misunderstanding. Therefore it seemed to him that to carry out the intention which the hon. and learned Gentleman had just announced it was quite necessary that the word "shall" should be substituted for the word "may" in the second line of the Amendment, and that he understood the Government were willing to accept. He would like to call attention to the entirely different position which had been created by the proposal of this Bill. The arguments for bringing off-licences under the Act of 1904 were by no means applicable to the present situation that the Bill had created. He could not help noticing when the hon. and learned Gentleman was speaking of the Act of 1902 he referred to what he termed the bargain then made by the off-licences according to which the present holders of these licences secured a freehold for their licences. But the Government and their supporters refused to recognise that there was any binding arrangement under the Act of 1904 as regarded on-licences. If the argument held good that there was a bargain as regarded the off-licences it appeared to be an irresistible conclusion that there was also an understanding by which the Legislature was bound as regarded on-licences. The Act of 1904 dealt only with the one question of reduction. There was a desire in the House and outside that licences should be reduced, but there was not at that time a demand that off-licences should be reduced. The Government in this Bill were taking a very different course, and going very much further, because they were not only reducing the number of licences, but introducing the principle of veto, and many more stringent and urgent conditions according to which on-licences should be granted and controlled in future. Therefore the new situation which the Bill was intended to produce in the case of on-licences would undoubtedly place the off-licences, if they were not brought under similar conditions, in a position of privilege as compared with other classes of licences. In one particular he had no doubt it had escaped the attention of the Government, but apparently under the clause as drafted no conditions could be imposed on existing off-licences until the twenty-one years period had elapsed. New ones could be granted to-morrow, and no one would be injured by the conditions for anyone taking a new off-licence would do so with his eyes open, knowing the conditions to which he would be subjected. He was dealing entirely with the case of old licences. They would be subject to conditions and to payment of monopoly value after twenty-one years. But the old on-licences were to be subject to all the conditions—local veto and all the other disabilities—which, either separately or together, must result in reducing their value to their holders. They were to be subject to those conditions at the end of fourteen years. Therefore, off-licences would have a further privileged period, a seven years run, competing with the on-licences, whose trade was to be reduced, whose business was to be subject to new conditions, and in some cases swept away by the operation of the Act and by local veto. They would continue in an unassailable and privileged position so that they could establish themselves in the trade which was being lost to the on-licences which were subject to all these limitations. He was not complaining or trying to make the case in any way disadvantageous to off-licence-holders. He was not one of those who thought that because a wrong was done a second wrong must be done to keep pace with it. He held that the off-licences merited tender and careful treatment, but it was remarkable that the Government should make all these exceptions in favour of, and show all this tenderness to, the present holders of off-licences, and that the whole weight of their vengeance should fall on the holders of on-licences alone, and those connected with them. This was a fact which everyone could grasp and which the Government in this clause had brought prominently and unmistakeably before the eyes of the country. On what principle did the Government intend to do away with on-licences and allow off-licences to escape the weight of their vengeance altogether?

Mr. YOUNGER seconded the Amendment. He pointed out that under the Government Amendment the new off-licences granted under the Bill would be charged only monopoly value on the basis of the new definition in the Bill and not that in the 1904 Act which of course was entirely different. It therefore placed the off-licence holder in an infinitely better position to get a new licence than the on-licence-holder. If that was intended he would like to know why. Possibly the Solicitor-General had only just found it out.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'may,' and to insert the word 'shall.'"—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to consequential Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

*Mr. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) moved to add at the end of the subsection the words: "Provided that the conditions to be attached to the granting of new off-licences shall include such conditions as the justices think best adapted for ensuring that the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be carried on separately from the sale of other commodities and that such liquors separately charged and paid for." This Amendment was one which he put down a long time ago for consideration on the Committee stage, but unfortunately, owing to the guillotine, this clause was not discussed at all, and consequently no Amendments were possible. It was a matter for regret that, owing to the procedure which had been adopted, they were unable to discuss the important questions of the conditions upon which off-licences should be carried on under the Bill. As the House was well aware this was a matter which had created a great deal of interest in past years, and was demanding much attention to-day. The subject was considered of great importance by both sides of the House and by all parties, and it was one which ought to have been dealt with in any measure purporting to be an Amendment of the licensing laws. This clause afforded a very good opportunity to discuss the question. They knew that the provisions of Section 4 of the Act of 1904 were to apply to new off-licences as they had hitherto applied to new on-licences, and new off-licences would in the future come before the magistrates in the same way as on-licences, and would have to receive consideration at the hands of the magistrates who would be able to impose conditions which in the past they had not had the power to impose. It was the nature of some of those conditions which he asked the Government to consider on this occasion. One of the conditions which would have to be imposed on a new off-licence would be one to secure to the public the monopoly value. The right hon. Gentleman said just now that he did not think there would be any considerable monopoly value attached to off-licences, but he did not hold that view. The Licensing bench upon which he sat had refrained from granting new off-licences and there was no doubt that in that district the existing off-licences had a monopoly value, and they would possess a far greater monopoly value when the number of public-houses in the district was reduced. By the new definition of monopoly value contained in the new section, and also the old section of the Act of 1904, a grocer's licence would have to be looked upon as possessing a duplicate character, that portion of it which had to do with the sale of intoxicating liquors being assessed as having a monopoly value, whilst the other portion would be excluded from that assessment. Therefore, from that point of view alone, he submitted that it was of importance that the business arrangements in those shops where other trades besides the sale of intoxicating liquor were carried on should be kept separate. But apart from that practical reason which he urged in support of his Amendment there was also the moral reason. Grocers' licences had existed for many years, and he believed it was recognised on all sides and by all parties that, however much they conduced to the convenience of a certain section of the community, they were open to very great abuses and had brought about some very serious evils. It was with a view to remedying to a certain extent some of those evils that he had ventured to make the suggestion he was now putting forward. With reference to this matter he would draw attention to the action taken by the House as long ago as 1872, when the Licensing Act of that year was passed. The question before them was discussed at that time upon an Amendment moved by Sir Henry Selwyn-Ibbetson. It was resisted by the then Liberal Government, but it was carried notwithstanding that opposition. The object of that Amendment was to place the grocers on the same footing as other people who dealt in intoxicating liquor. In the year 1878 a Royal Commission was appointed to consider the question of grocers' licences in Scotland, and that Commission reported that the combination of the liquor dealer with the grocer was fraught with great danger, and had been productive of great evil. The Commission were inclined to believe that the only solution of the difficulty in order to remedy the evils complained of would be the entire separation of the two trades. But they felt that they could not recommend such a separation because of certain difficulties, mostly of a local character. In view of the difficulties which existed that Commission were of the opinion that other measures could be more speedily taken to reduce the evil, although they were very much impressed by the serious evils which this system of grocers' licences had brought about. The subject was again considered by Lord Peel's Royal Commission in 1899. Even the Majority Report recommended that grocers' licences should be brought into the same category as the on-licences and should come under the purview of the justices, while the Minority Report contained a striking passage in which they stated that remarkable facts had been placed before them by various individuals who had given evidence of a remarkable character on this subject. He did not need to trouble the House with those facts beyond stating that they tended to show that the mixture of the two trades of supplying groceries and intoxicating liquor provided great opportunities for secret drinking and great temptations to persons who might otherwise be saved from falling victims to drink. He did not need to weary the House with an account of the instances quoted before the Royal Commission, because they were all aware of the evils which could be seen at the present day. He was told only the other day of the case of an assistant in a large grocery establishment who had sold a bottle of whisky to a customer, and that customer insisted that it should be put down as groceries. Unfortunately that assistant was provided with too stringent a conscience and he refused to do so. The customer complained to the head of the firm with the result that the assistant was dismissed. Cases of that kind were by no means rare, and it would be a great protection to grocers and dealers if they were compelled to conduct the two trades on a distinct footing.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked if the hon. Member meant to suggest by his Amendment that there should be a separate room in the same building or a separate compartment in the same room?

*MR. DICKINSON said he was just going to deal with that point. The Minority Report of the Peel Commission made a definite recommendation in favour of a separation of the trades so complete that there should be no sale within the same premises of intoxicants and groceries or other articles. That was their recommendation, but they pointed out that that might be hard upon the existing interests and they suggested that five years should be allowed during which the restriction should not apply to premises now holding a licence, but after that period they proposed that the grocery and the intoxicating liquor parts of the premises should be structurally separated. His Amendment did not go to that extent because he fully recognised the difficulties there would be in laying down a definite rule that in all grocery establishments where wine and beer were sold there should be an absolute structural separation of the premises. The Amendment contemplated that the justices would have to do their best to ensure that the sale of intoxicating liquors should be carried on separately from the sale of other commodities. The proposal was one which could not have any very immediate or harsh effect upon any existngi interest. In the first place, it only applied to new licences. He confessed that when he drafted the Amendment he had hoped that grocers' licenses would in all respects come under the same category as on-licences. He had hoped that at the end of the fourteen years period existing grocers' licenses would have become new licences, and that then the magistrates would have insisted on some kind of separation between the two kinds of business. That was before the Solicitor-General's Amendment was carried. He could see that the result of the Amendment just now carried would be to prevent that coming into operation. At the same time it would be of great value if justices would attach that condition to new licences. The justices would not insist on structural separation. He knew from experience that they were fully alive to the importance of dealing with grocers' licences. They would be able to make ordinary commonsense arrangements, which could be varied according to the requirements of different cases. If possible there should be separate departments of the premises, or, at any rate a separate cupboard or counter. At present in large grocery establishments there was a separate department, and in most grocers' shops where intoxicating liquors were sold the liquors were kept separate. He was fully persuaded that the magistrates could without difficulty or hardship devise proper means to bring about this result. At any rate, they could always do what would be of very great importance—they could insist that the taking of the orders and the charging for the same should be carried out separately from the orders for other commodities. The change he had indicated would be very gradual, but none the less it would be of great value. He was sure the justices would try to carry out the principle to the utmost of their power, and gradually there would be brought about a system whereby the conjunction of the two kinds of traffic would be remedied. The present system had been disapproved of and discountenanced by every Commission that had inqured into the matter. He thought it was generally felt by those who had taken an interest in the social condition of the people that there was a real abuse in connection with grocers' licences. He believed that that could be remedied without much difficulty. What he proposed would make the dealers themselves more careful how they carried on their business, and no doubt by this somewhat minor change in the law an improvement in the practice would be effected which would very likely result in saving many persons and homes from the degradation of drink. He begged to move.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock) seconded the Amendment. It appeared to him to be a very useful Amendment, and not antagonistic to the desires of the Government as expressed in the Bill. One of the great objections to grocers' licences was that they had led to a large amount of secret drinking. He was one of those who held that it would be very much better if grocers' licences were treated in the same way as other licences under the Bill, but as that had not been done there was no reason why this Amendment should not be made. It would have the effect of preventing a certain amount of the great evil of secret drinking. The Amendment had the assent of a large body of public opinion. It seemed to him that the House would be very wise in accepting it. Of course, it might be said that the justices had already the power to administer the law, but they were not forced to make any conditions, although, if they chose, they could do so. The Amendment would compel them to make conditions, but, while compelling them, it left to their discretion what the conditions should be. It was a reasonable Amendment which the Government might very well accept.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 36, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'Provided that the conditions to be attached to the granting of new off-licences shall include such conditions as the justices think best adapted for ensuring that the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be carried on separately from the sale of other commodities, and that such liquors be separately charged and paid for.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR S. EVANS said the mover of the Amendment had made a very interesting speech in regard to grocers' licences generally. Although these licences had often been called grocers' licences, they were not restricted to grocers at all; they were off-licences. He could not at this stage of the Bill go very largely into the discussion of that question. He had heard a great deal in regard to the mode in which these off-licences should be dealt with. He had read both sides of the question, and he had still an open mind upon it. He was not at all sure that the evil complained of as appertaining to grocers' licences was as great as some people imagined. No doubt there were cases where the evil existed, but he was not at all sure that the instances were not exaggerated so far as their number was concerned. He was also aware that on this particular topic there was no desire on the part of those who sold intoxicating liquors under on-licences to minimise the evil which did exist. However, that was a matter which was open to discussion and a great deal of argument on one side and the other, and, nearing as they were the end of the Report stage of the Bill, he did not think they could argue it further now. The alteration which would be made by the Amendment was extremely slight. The hon. Member sought to apply it to new off-licences only. They would be few in number. At present there existed of these licences 25,000, and there was a provision which enabled the justices to impose conditions, and even to refuse licences. He was not at all sure that even in the limited number of cases to which the Amendment would apply it would have the force and virtue which the hon. Member thought would attend it if carried. He did not know from the terms of the Amendment whether the hon. Member proposed that there should be a restriction as to the room in which these liquors were sold. As the Amendment stood there was nothing to prevent a grocer from selling liquors on any part of the premises on which he liked to sell them. The Amendment required the justices to make conditions for ensuring that the sale of intoxicating liquors should be carried on separately from the sale of other commodities, and that such liquors should be separately charged and paid for. What difference would there be if the grocer or other tradesman did that? Anyone could go and ask for tea and sugar at one counter and for a bottle of wine at another counter, and the tradesman would have the greatest pleasure in putting the articles on separate bills. The Amendment would not be of the slightest use in that matter. The hon. Member had suggested that there should be a separate department, cupboard, or counter. It was quite obvious that in the Amendment there was no provision for anything of the kind. These words would have very little effect indeed. The main answer which the Government made to the Amendment was that the justices had now the power to do all that the Amendment would make them do, if they wished to do it. He would remind the House of the provisions of the Act of 1902 which, if put in force, would have a great deal of effect in checking the evils dealt with by the hon. Member. It was provided by that Act than an off-licence possessed by a person at a certain date should not be taken away from him unless for misconduct. By Section 10, subsection 4 of that Act, the justices were empowered, on proof of misconduct such as surreptitiously selling spirits and booking them as tea, to take away the licence. He hoped that he had satisfied the House and his hon. friend that the Amendment ought not to be adopted in the form in which it was moved, and that even, if it were adopted, the value of it would be very small indeed.

Amendment negatived.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS, in moving to omit Clause 6, said that this was an important provision to carry out the scheme of reduction. It made it obligatory on the licensing justices, before April 1st next or such later date as should be allowed by the Licensing Commission, to prepare a scheme for carrying out in their district the statutory reduction of licences required by the Act. The scheme had to show as respects each rural parish and urban area in the district, the effect as regards the number of licences of the Schedule scale as applied to the parish or area, giving particulars of any modification made in the strict application of the scale. The scheme had also to provide for the statutory reduction being distributed reasonably over the reduction period having regard to the circumstances of the district. What he wanted to ask was the meaning of the phrase "the licensing justices." He would suggest to the hon. and learned Gentleman that there were no such persons as "licensing justices," for the reason that each year the justices of each district had to assemble at the general annual licensing meeting. At that meeting they fixed dates for adjourned meetings, and days for the transfer of licences were appointed. But apart from that annual meeting there were no licensing justices. The justices who happened to be at that meeting were certainly licensing justices having the jurisdiction of licensing magistrates, but apart from that they were not licensing justices. If the Government meant the justices of the district apart from the justices assembled at the annual licensing meeting the Bill ought to say so, and to give directions as to their meetings. In boroughs, as the House was aware, the licensing committee was appointed at a meeting of the justices of the borough a fortnight before the general annual meeting. But that committee had no more power than the annual licensing meeting in a country district. His point was that the Bill did not say who were the licensing justices who were to be served with a writ of mandamus. The clause made it obligatory on the licensing justices to prepare a scheme and submit it as soon as possible to the Licensing Commission. They had no option; they must do it whether they liked it or not. Whether or not under the present law they were reducing the number of licences sufficiently, and acting to the satisfaction of the public generally, they must prepare a scheme. He had the honour to represent a large borough where the licences were being reduced most satisfactorily without any scheme at all, especially in the centre part of the borough, where the population was dense, and the licences were superabundant. But they had no details by which they could judge the ratio between licences and the density of population. His hon. friend asked whether the Government would not institute some inquiry in order to give them this necessary information, and the reply of the Government was that it would entail too much labour. How were the justices to prepare a scheme satisfactorily without that detailed information? But going back to what he was saying with regard to his own city, the acreage of the borough with the present population would give an average ratio of nineteen persons to the acre. According to the Schedule in the Bill, one licence was to be given for every 500 persons. That would provide a statutory reduction under the Bill in the course of fourteen years of 258 on-licences. What was going on at the present moment? The on-licences were being reduced with compensation at the rate of twenty per annum, and ten in addition without compensation, or thirty in all; but he would only put it at twenty-five, which in fourteen years would reduce the licences by 350, instead of 258.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said that the hon. Member must not multiply by fourteen because there was no guarantee that the rate of reduction would be maintained.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS said that the licences which were predominant, and which would be reduced in the same way as they were now, were old ante-1869 beerhouse licences. These old licences were created perhaps on a wrong principle, but they were being taken away under the operation of the present law. He must multiply by fourteen, and that gave him, as he said, 350 on-licences reduced in the course of the fourteen years period, or ninety-two licences more than would be reduced under the Government scheme. His argument was that the justices were at their own discretion reducing licences more in proportion than would be done under the scheme of the Bill. Coming back to the clause, the scheme was to be prepared, and the effect of it shown with the modifications mentioned in the Schedule. Those modifications were very important. They made provision for areas where there was a large influx of population during the day, such as in London, and for seaside places where the population varied according to the period of the year. In the Bill, there was no provision whatever for any of the parties interested in the premises being consulted, or represented before the justices, or the Licensing Commission. There was no consultation at all. The licensing justices of their own free will were to make a scheme, and there was no provision for the parties interested being represented either before the licensing justice or the Licensing Commission. They entirely objected to that. Under sub-clause (*b*) the scheme provided that the statutory reduction should be distributed "reasonably" over the period, and might he ask the hon. and learned Gentleman how he interpreted the word. Would it be reasonable for the justices to say to the Licensing Commission: "We think that it would be better, on the whole, to postpone this reduction until the end of the reduction period. You, the Licensing Commissioners, want the money for other districts, postpone it in this; we think the population is increasing in our district and that matter will settle it." The Licensing Commissioners would say: "Oh, wise justices, we will postpone it, take the surplus which you are good enough to send us and apply it in other directions, in Wales or elsewhere." But supposing the justices were to say: "We think that speedy reduction is better; we do not want to postpone it till the end of the period; we do not know what will happen to this population; let us take it at once; let us be sure of our ground." The Licensing Commission would say "Yes, perhaps on the whole it is reasonable," and who could say it was not reasonable? As he had said at the start, this was a clause which took it out of the discretion of the local justices, and that was their great objection to it. Their case was that under the present law the local justices were doing their duty, and doing it well, plus the justices in Quarter Sessions. Why interfere with the present law and make the Commissioners arbiters for every district, parish, urban area, ward and borough, throughout England and Wales? In opposing the Bill of his party in 1904 Ministerialists said that the then Government would not trust the licensing justices; but now it was they themselves who would not do so. He might point out that the justices could reduce without any scheme at all if the Government would leave it to them. For the reasons he had given he hoped, though perhaps it might be a rather distant hope, that the Government would see their way at all events to modify the plan of the Bill. He begged to move the omission of Clause 6.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University), in seconding, said that, as he understood the procedure of this clause, the suggested method was that the licensing justices, whoever they were, should meet together and draw up a scheme, and in drawing up that scheme they would have considerable and important powers, the exercise of which would entail very large financial considerations for a large number of people. As he understood it, none of these people would have any opportunity of being heard before the licensing justices at all. Supposing the licensing bench were divided in opinion upon the drawing up of the scheme. The majority might take a very strong temperance view and want to reduce the licences in accordance with the statute, while the minority were in favour of granting licences to a larger number of places. The majority would carry the day, and the scheme would be sent to the Licensing Commission, who, after giving the licensing justices an opportunity of consulting with them, might make such alterations as they wished. The minority would be anxious to have the scheme altered. Were they alone to be heard, or were the majority alone to be heard? Was this consultation, moreover, to be in public, or were the public not to know what went on between the justices and the Commission? Before the Licensing Commission there would be thousands of pounds at stake, and nobody would be allowed to appear. The proprietor of a large seaside hotel would have no opportunity of appearing before either the justices or the Commission when the report of the majority of the justices came before them. What did the Government mean the procedure was to be in regard to the consultation between the justices and the Commission? Was it to be in public or not; were the parties to have any *locus standi* before either body at all, or could they send their views to the Commissioners? He thought the Solicitor-General would agree with him that this was somewhat a new departure from anything we had in English law at the present time. He considered that the public ought to be informed of the procedure which the Government proposed to establish.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 2, to leave out Clause 6."—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'first' in page 5, line 3, stand part of the Bill."

SIR S. EVANS: I venture humbly to congratulate the hon. Member for Sheffield on having moved an Amendment and made a speech without referring to the three gentlemen or the trio in London. It is quite clear who the licensing justices are. They have been actually defined ever since the year 1872, by Section 74 of the Act of that year, as the justices having jurisdiction in respect of the grant of new licences in the licensing districts as laid down in a previous Act, and amended by that Act. The hon. Member will find that provision throughout licensing legislation, and in the Acts of 1902 and 1904 the phrase "the licensing justices" is constantly used. The licensing justices who will have to prepare the schemes under Clause 6 when the Act comes into operation will be the licensing justices in the licensing districts. The word "reasonably" is a term importing a question of fact, and not a question of law, and I desire at the outset once and for all to say that I cannot give a legal definition of a particular word when that particular word is not capable of a definition. Everybody knows that the word "reasonably" is a question of fact, and is not capable of legal definition. I have no doubt the justices will act "reasonably" in making a scheme to extend over fourteen years. The great part of the speech of the hon. Member was really directed towards Clause 1, which compels the justices to make the reduction in accordance with the scale of the schedule, and Clause 6 is machinery to enable them to do it.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS said there need not be a scale at all.

Sir S. EVANS: But they are bound to reduce according to some scale, and if there is to be anybody who is to have control over the justices it is obvious that there must be some such machinery as this. As to the question of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, we have purposely left the procedure, as between the licensing justices acting locally on the one hand, and the Licensing Commission acting in London, or locally through themselves or their representatives, elastic. It is not a legal proceeding at all. ["Hear, hear."] I do not mean that it is an unlawful proceeding as the hon. and learned Member would rather indicate by his cheer, but it is a piece of administrative work. While the justices have locally to prepare a scheme the Licensing Commission in London must take all the circumstances into consideration, and there will be the fullest opportunity for the justices to communicate with the Commission and for the Commission to communicate with the justices. I have no doubt that the Commission will avail themselves of the opportunity they have of sending representatives down to the localities in order to see if the scheme ought to be modified or passed in its entirety. There will also be an opportunity for the minority to place their views before the Licensing Commission, and even a single justice will be able to communicate with that body. He will have the fullest right to lay his views before the Commission, and those views will be listened to and given such weight to as they deserve. We purposely have not made rules, as if this was a legal proceeding, and the proceedings will be of the most elastic kind. I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman will put us to the trouble of dividing on this particular clause. We must have machinery of this kind, and so far as the criticism to-night has gone it is not directed to this particular clause.

Mr. YOUNGER said they were obliged to divide against the clause, because they objected to subsection (4).

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 271; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 389.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Chesh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.

Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt HnSir W.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, G. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,CaptHnA.C.(Kincard.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robet (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir RobertJ.(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George G.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 5, line 34, after the word 'licences,' to insert the word 'proposed.'"

"In page 5, line 36, to leave out the first word 'the,' and to insert the words 'any such.'"

"In page 5, line 36, after the word 'licence,' to insert the words 'which they decide to extinguish.'"

"In page 5, line 37, to leave out the words '1828 to 1906.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question, "That further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. L. Harcourt,*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

Whereupon, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at Eighteen minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 17*th November*, 1908.

BARON KILMAINE.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of John Edward Deane, Baron Kilmaine in the Peerage of Ireland to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES No. 28. (1908.)

Agreement and protocol between the United Kingdom and Germany with regard to sleeping sickness; signed at London, 27th October, 1908.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 4166. Portugal (Angola).

No. 4167. Morocco (Tangier).

No. 4168. Netherlands (Commerce and Finance).

No. 4169. Cuba (Budget, 1908–1909).

No. 4170. Western Pacific (Friendly Islands).

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 669. France (Chemical, Metal, and Mining Industries of Lyons Consular District).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Order made by the council of the county of Durham, constituting a new polling district for the township of Hedley Hope, in the north-western Parliamentary division of the county.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905 (REGULATIONS MADE BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD).

Supplemental regulations amending the Regulations Organisation for Unemployed, 1905, so far as regards the conditions under which an application may be entertained by a distress committee.

Regulations rescinding the supplemental regulations and making further regulations for the like purpose.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

Return of the amount of notes issued more than forty years and outstanding on 28th October 1908, which have been written off.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871.

Application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol, referred by His Majesty in Council for the consideration and report of a committee of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council; together with the draft of the charter applied for.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 226.)

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

LORD ATKINSON: My Lords, I beg to move, in respect of this Bill, the Motion standing in my name on the Paper. That portion of the Standing Order which I ask your Lordships to dispense with did not contemplate the case of an autumn session. I desire the Standing Order suspended to enable me to put down for Second Reading this Bill, the object of which is to amend the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Act, 1891, by providing that omission to register may be rectified in certain cases.

Moved, "To dispense with so much of Standing Order No. XXXVIII as provides that the eight sitting days notice of Second Reading required when a Bill brought from the House of Commons has remained on the Table of this House for twelve sitting days without any Lord giving notice of the Second Reading thereof shall not be given notice after the first day of August."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ADMISSION OF THE PRESS) BILL.

Report of Amendments received.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved an Amendment in Clause 1, subsection (2)—

> (2) "Notwithstanding anything contained in subsection (1) any local authority may make regulations as to the accommodation to be provided for representatives of the Press, and the manner in which the same is to be allotted; but no such regulations shall enable such local authorities to exclude the representatives of any newspaper on the ground of its opinions, or on the ground of any reports or comments published by such newspaper or through the agency of such representatives,"—

to insert, before the word "accommodation," the word "reasonable." This, he explained, was little more than a drafting Amendment.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 14, after the word 'the' to insert the word 'reasonable.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE next moved an Amendment providing that this accommodation for the Press should be allotted "regard being had to the number of the representatives for whom accommodation is likely to be required and the size of the room in which the meetings of the local authority are held." This Amendment was merely explanatory.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 16, after the word 'allotted' to insert the words 'regard being had to the number of the representatives for whom accommodation is likely to be required, and the size of the room in which the meetings of the local authority are held.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN regarded the Amendment as mere surplusage. Every authority had "regard" to the number of the representatives of the Press and they found all the reasonable accommodation that the size of the room would admit. He would not, however, oppose the Amendment, as it was his intention subsequently to move to omit the subsection altogether.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN moved to omit the whole of amended subsection (2). He pointed out that this provision was merely enacting what was already done in every public and council meeting at the present time. As the subsection originally stood, a local authority would have been compelled to find accommodation without any regard to the size of the room; nothing was said which would have prevented the necessity of increasing the size of the room if the number of Pressmen requiring to be admitted rendered that course necessary. The insertion of the words "reasonable accommodation," however, met that to a certain extent; but it merely set down in words what was now done by every local authority. He saw no need to make a statutory regulation on the subject, as there had been no complaint except this unknown case from somewhere in Wales.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, lines 13 to 20, to leave out subsection (2)."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said the case from Wales was not an unknown case, but represented the decision of one Judge confirmed by three Judges in the Court of Appeal. The subsection in question was not drafted by the promoters of the Bill; it was inserted at the request of the London County Council, who, presumably, knew something of the needs of the county councils as affected by this Bill. He would regret to see the subsection struck out, as it had been agreed to by the promoters to meet the special circumstances as they existed in London. He would not press his objection to the Amendment, however, for the reason that the subsection was not part of the original Bill.

LORD ALLENDALE said the subsection was inserted in Standing Committee in the other House for the reason given by Lord Donoughmore, and it seemed to the Local Government Board to be on the whole a convenient and useful provision. In some cases more representatives of the Press might seek admission than could well be accommodated, and this difficulty could be got over under the subsection by making regulations on the subject. Without some such provision it might happen that where more Pressmen applied for admission than could be accommodated, the early comers would claim the seats and this might lead to difficulties. He could not see any reason why the subsection should be deleted, but if Lord Donoughmore did not press his objection to the Amendment, he (Lord Allendale) would not be prepared to do so.

LORD BELPER said the Bill provided for the admission of representatives of the Press to the meetings of all local authorities. He questioned whether that was a desirable enactment; but, if Parliament adopted the principle, he maintained that the accommodation should be of such a character that the representatives of the Press would be able to give a sufficient and adequate report of the proceedings. It seemed to him that the two things hung together. He would not have been surprised if his noble friend, Lord Camperdown, had moved to omit the whole of the Bill, but he failed to see the reason for rejecting subsection (2) if the principal provision were agreed to.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to insert a new subsection requiring that three clear days at least before any meeting of the local authority, notice of the time and place of the intended meeting and of the business proposed to be transacted thereat, signed by the clerk or other responsible officer, should be fixed in some conspicuous place on or near the outer door of the place of meeting of the local authority; provided that this subsection should not apply as respects any meeting of a local authority of which not less than three clear days public notice was required by any statute or regulation to be given. He said the provision in the Amendment as to the giving of three clear days notice was identical with that in the Schedule of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, and Section 232 of the same Act specified where the notice was to be fixed. The Local Government Act of 1888, Section 75, applied those provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act to county councils. Therefore by the second part of his Amendment those authorities which were already under this obligation were excepted. If the Press were to be at liberty to attend the meetings of local authorities, it was not unreasonable that they should have some means of knowing when those meetings were to take place. Their Lordships had decided that it was not desirable that notices of the meetings should be actually sent to the Press, but he submitted that a notice as to time and place of the intended meeting should be fixed in some conspicuous place.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'representatives,' to insert the following new subsection: '(3) Three clear days at least before any meeting of the local authority, notice of the time and place of the intended meeting and of the business proposed to be transacted thereat, signed by the clerk or other responsible officer, shall be fixed in some conspicuous place on or near the outer door of the place of meeting of the local authority. Provided that this subsection shall not apply as respects any meeting of a local authority of which not less than three clear days public notice is required by any statute or regulation to be given.' "—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN was sorry to appear to be continually opposing his noble friend's proposals. But did this Amendment come within the purview of the Bill? The object of the measure was—

"To provide for the admission of representatives of the Press to the meetings of certain local authorities."

That was perfectly clear; but this Amendment gave an instruction to local authorities as to the notice they should give of their meetings. As a matter of fact, only minor authorities would come under the subsection, as the larger bodies were already provided for. He suggested that nothing could be more inconvenient than that a distress committee, for example, should not be able to hold a meeting unless it had given three days previous notice.

LORD ALLENDALE did not think there was very much in the objection that the Amendment was not within the scope of the Bill. He did not offer any opposition on the part of the Government to the Amendment, as it only extended to the minor authorities the obligation which county councils, town councils, and Metropolitan borough councils were now under.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE thought the answer to the noble Earl's contention that the Amendment was outside the purview of the Bill was to be found in the fact that a similar provision was in the Bill before the noble Earl and his friends struck it out.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Two blacks do not make a white.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said their Lordships need have no anxiety with regard to the Amendment being in order, as the original provision relating to the giving of notice had withstood the fire which was always directed against measures from that point of view in the other House. If everything in a Bill had to be covered by the title, he thought the noble Earl, with all his skill as a draftsman, would experience difficulty in finding titles for all the Bills that passed through their Lordships' House.

LORD BELPER said that, personally, he had no objection to the Amendment, as county councils were not only obliged under the present law to give notice of their meetings, but invariably sent an agenda to the representatives of the Press who regularly attended their meetings.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved to insert a clause providing that nothing in the Bill should be construed so as to prohibit a local authority from admitting the public to its meetings. He explained that the object of this Amendment was to redeem a pledge he had given in Committee. He noticed that Lord Belper had on the Paper an Amendment to this Amendment to add to the new clause the words "and, subject to the accommodation available, the public shall have the right of admission to meetings of local authorities at all times when the Press is admitted to such meetings under this Act." He was quite willing to accept this addition.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 4 to insert the following new clause: 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prohibit a local authority from admitting the public to its meetings.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD BELPER then moved his Amendment to this Amendment, and expressed his satisfaction that the noble Earl in charge of the Bill was prepared to accept it. It was only for the purpose of putting the public in the same position as the Press.

Amendment to the Amendment moved—

"To insert at the end of the proposed new clause the words 'and, subject to the accommodation available, the public shall have the right of admission to meetings of local authorities at all times when the Press is admitted to such meetings under this Act.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 227.)

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 17th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petitions for legislation: From Burnham; Wells; and Weston-super-Mare; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Holywell; and Tenby; to lie upon the Table.

TRAWLING IN PROHIBITED AREAS PREVENTION BILL.

Petition from Zetland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos.

4166 to 4170 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 669 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 28, 1908).

Copy presented, of Agreement and Protocol between the United Kingdom and Germany with regard to Sleeping Sickness. Signed at London, 27th October, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 29, 1908).

Copy presented, of Protocol between the United Kingdom, the Independent State of the Congo, France, Germany, Portugal and Spain, prohibiting the Importation of Fire-arms, Ammunition, etc., within a certain zone in Western Equatorial Africa. Signed at Brussels, 22nd July, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 30, 1908).

Copy presented, of Accession of Liberia to the International Copyright Convention of 9th September, 1886, and the Additional Act and Declaration of 4th May, 1896. 16th October, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Durham, constituting a new Polling District for the Township of Hedley Hope, in the North-Western Parliamentary Division of the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871.

Copy presented, of Application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol, referred by His Majesty in Council for the consideration and report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, together with a Copy of the Draft of the Charter applied for [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Copies presented, of Regulations made by the Local Government Board, dated 11th November and 17th November, 1908, respectively, being: (1) Supplemental Regulations amending the Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed, 1905) so far as regards the conditions under which an Application may be entertained by a Distress Committee; (2) Regulations rescinding the Supplemental Regulations and making further Regulations for the like purpose [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Leave of Postal Officials.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has yet arrived at any decision with regard to the amount of leave to be granted to officers of the Post Office; and, if not, when his decision may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Question is still under my consideration.

County Councils and Motor Car Speeds.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will say how many county councils and other local authorities have during the past twelve months asked for power to regulate the speed of motor cars in their respective areas.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I presume my hon. friend refers to the number of authorities by whom applications have been made to the local Government Board during the last twelve months for regulations imposing restrictions on the speed of motor cars. The number of such authorities is twenty-seven. Under the existing law local authorities cannot themselves be empowered to make regulations on this subject.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether in view of the statement recently issued by the highway committee of the Surrey County Council, that during the past twelve months of all the applications made to the local Government Board by the council to reduce the speed of motor cars only two had been inquired into by that body, he will see into the reasons of this delay.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) During the past twelve months two separate applications, and two only, have been made to the Board by the Surrey County Council for the imposition of low speed limits for motor cars. An inquiry has been held upon one of them, relating to three roads in Walton and Woking, and the Board have agreed to comply with the application. The second, which relates to roads in Farnham and Godalming, was received last week. Notice of the proposal will be advertised forthwith.

Payments from Vote 32, Class 2, Subhead A.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will give the names of all persons receiving £100 a year or more out of Subhead A., Vote 32, Class 2, of Civil Service Estimates, stating the amount paid yearly in each case and the nature of the service for which it is paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The following table affords the information asked for—

Name.	For Service as	Salary. £	s.	d.
Max S. Green - - - -	Private Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, for himself and clerks.	829	0	8
The Earl of Liverpool, M.VO. -	State Steward and Chamberlain	500	0	0
Sir Antony Weldon, Bart., D.S.O.	Vice Chamberlain - - -	300	0	0
Gavin M. Hamilton - - -	Assistant Vice Chamberlain -	150	0	0
Miss O. Phillips - - -	Permanent Clerk - - -	120	0	0
The Right Hon. Lord Pirrie -	Comptroller - - - -	300	0	0
W. Harris - - - -	Financial Secretary and Accountant.	200	0	0
John Lentaigne, M.D. - -	Surgeon to the Household -	100	0	0
Captain E. C. Coates - -	Military Secretary - - -	250	0	0
Viscount Anson - - -	Acting Master of the Horse and Aide de Camp.	350	0	0
Captain A. J. Hunter - -	Aide de Camp - - -	200	0	0
Mervyn Gwynn Williams -	Aide de Camp - - -	125	0	0

Leasing of Foreshores.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the acreage of foreshore in the United Kingdom sold or leased by His Majesty's Commissioners of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues during the last ten years to local authorities and to other bodies or private individuals; whether, before parting with the Crown's interests in any part of the foreshore to other bodies or private individuals for any consideration, the Commissioners have first offered it on similar terms to the local authorities for the public use and enjoyment; and, if not, whether the Commissioners will consider the possibility of making it a rule to do so in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The following are particulars of foreshores sold or leased by the Commissioners of Woods (excluding sales or leases of less than an acre) for the ten years to 31st March last. Sold to local authorities, about 48 acres; to other bodies or private individuals, 95 acres. These latter include 24 acres sold to Government Departments, 18 acres sold for the purpose of works carried out under Parliamentary authority or with the sanction of the Board of Trade, and 28 acres conveyed as part of an arrangement for the settlements of an adverse claim. Leased to local authorities, about 4,968 acres; to other bodies or private individuals, about 3,219 acres, made up of 113 acres leased to Government Departments, 867 acres for the purposes of works authorised by Parliament or sanctioned by the Board of Trade, 117 acres previously offered to the local authorities on similar terms and refused by them, and 2,122 acres let without being so offered mostly on short tenancies in continuation of previous similar lettings. The majority of sales and long leases are now made for purposes of reclamation or for other works sanctioned by Parliament or the Board of Trade; but, in the remaining cases, I agree as to the general desirability of giving the preference to local authorities, though no hard and fast rule can be laid down in view of varying circumstances.

Small Holdings—Eviction in Bedfordshire.

MR. WHITBREAD (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board has any official information showing that at Swineshead, in Bedfordshire, notice to quit his holding has been served by a landowner on a tenant, on the ground that the tenant was an agitator for small holdings and that the owner hoped he would leave the village; and whether the Government will consider the question of providing, by legislation or otherwise, against such occurrences in future.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The President is making full inquiry into this matter, and I will be glad to inform my hon. friend of the result.

Small Holdings at Oxted (Surrey).

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board has received a Memorandum from Mr. C. A. Fane relating to the position of affairs at Oxted, in Surrey; whether he is aware that two members of the Oxted Land Club each applied for an acre of land to the Surrey County Council, that the council kept the application for ten months and subsequently referred the men to the Oxted Parish Council, and that the parish council informed them that there was no land available nearer than Oxted village, which is a mile and a half away from the hamlet in which they live; whether, in view of the fact that the applicants have now asked for more than 1 acre of land, the Board will instruct the Surrey County Council to deal with their application and provide them with land in the neighbourhood where they live; and whether there is suitable land available in that neighbourhood.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) We received the Memorandum a few days ago and are inquiring into the matter. I will communicate the result of the inquiry to my hon. friend.

Imprisonment of Persons under Sixteen Years of Age.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any, and, if so, how many persons of sixteen years of age or upwards are now imprisoned or kept in penal servitude in respect of offences committed by them when under sixteen years of age.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The number of such persons serving sentences of imprisonment is twenty-five, and one is serving a sentence of penal servitude. Total, twenty-six.

Unemployment—Case of Dillon.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his atenttion has been called to the case of a labourer, named Dillon, who was charged on Saturday at the Tower Bridge Police Court with attempting suicide, and stated that he had seven children at home in want of food, and one of them was dying, and that he had been out of work sixteen weeks, and applied in vain to the borough council for work; can he state in what union did Dillon live; whether the guardians of the union gave medical out-relief freely to children who were ill and whose parents could not pay for a doctor, or whether they put it on loan or required the parents to come into the workhouse if they needed medical relief for their children; and whether in that union the statutory provisions, that the guardians should give employment to those who were unemployed and had no means to maintain themselves, were carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I understand that Dillon resides in the parish of Camberwell. Medical relief is given on loan in this parish, but I have no reason to doubt that it is given freely in cases in which it is required. The guardians do not give employment to those who are unemployed and unable to maintain themselves except as a condition of relief.

Relief of Unemployed at Whitechapel.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that about 200 unemployed men were given orders for the workhouse by the Whitechapel Guardians on or about 5th November, after applying to the board for work or relief; that the chairman of the board said that the guardians were powerless to give outdoor relief; and that the master of the workhouse told the guardians that the house was full, but he would do his best for the men with blankets, and accommodate them on the floor ot the receiving room; whether, if the workhouse was full, the men were entitled to outdoor relief (having regard to the judgments of the Court of Appeal in the Merthyr Tydfil case) if they were ready and willing to perform any task of work which the guardians might impose in accordance with the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order, 1852; and whether, even if the workhouse were not full, the guardians could, instead of offering the workhouse, have given them employment and relief under that order.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have made inquiry and am informed that the guardians know nothing of the exceptional circumstances mentioned in the Question. During the week ended 7th November, the relieving officer gave 55 orders for the workhouse to destitute persons who were without permanent residence in the union, but not a single order was given or applied for in the case of anyone with a home in the union. In about half a dozen instances genuine unemployed residents sought the advice of the relieving officers, and these have been found work, either through the borough suveyor or through the agencies in the district. The workhouse is certified for 818 inmates and the highest number in it throughout the week ended 7th November was 642, so that there was no occasion for any such observations as those attributed to the master.

Relief of Unemployed where no Distress Committee exists.

MR. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can hold out any hope of its being possible for him to make immediate grants from the fund at his disposal for the unemployed to those towns, not being county boroughs, and districts where there is no distress committee appointed under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 but where there is a relief committee known as the mayor's committee

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The grant is voted for expenses under the Act, and consequently payments from it can only be made where a central body or distress committee have been set up under the Act.

Changes in the Coastguard Service.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state when the Report as to the proposed changes in regard to the coastguard service will be submitted to the House for consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The retransfer of revenue duties to the Board of Customs, now performed by the coastguard, can only be effected by Act of Parliament. It is hoped a Bill for this purpose will be introduced next session, and it would be premature to make a statement in anticipation of the introduction of the Bill.

Condition of Schools at Limpsfield.

MR. BRODIE: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Board's inspector has, during several years, called the attention of the managers of the schools at Limpsfield, Surrey, to the unsatisfactory condition of the schools and to the overcrowding that exists in them; whether the school at Limpsfield Chart was closed in June, 1907, causing additional overcrowding in the schools in Limpsfield village; whether he is aware that some of the children have to kneel on the floor to write; and whether anything can be done to remedy this state of affairs.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am aware that the premises of the Limpsfield Church school are far from satisfactory, and that the school is seriously overcrowded. Plans for carrying out the necessary improvements were approved by the Board in July, and I propose to require that the work should be immediately put in hand if the recognition of the school is to continue. The provision of a new council school for 200 children has been sanctioned, and the Board have inquired of the local authority as to when the plans of the site will be submitted. The local authority are being urged to press on the provision of the new school with all possible despatch and to provide such temporary accommodation as is necessary in the meantime.

Suggested Close Time for Herrings.

MR. ROBERT HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that, owing to the absence of statutory provision for a close time for herring fishing, quantities of immature fish have been recently caught and thrown into the sea as useless; and whether, in view of this fact, and of the results of the past season's fishing, he is prepared to introduce legislation in regard to close time.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) No complaints of recent capture of immature fish have reached me and, as at present advised, I do not see my way to introduce legislation in the sense suggested by my hon. friend.

Legal Expenses of Irish Local Bodies.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state, of the local bodies subject to the audit of the Local Government Board, how many pay a fixed sum yearly to a solicitor and how many do not; of those who pay a fixed sum yearly to a solicitor how many make additional payments to the same solicitor, and how many do not; on what principle does an auditor allow additional payments in such cases; and by what means does he protect the ratepayers from paying twice for the same service.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board are not in possession of any information with regard to the first part of the Question. In auditing accounts the auditors have regard to the terms of the agreements made by councils with their solicitors and, by investigation of particulars of costs passed by councils, take every possible care to secure that the ratepayers are not charged twice for the same service.

Irish Local Government Auditors.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if all the official local government auditors have passed a similar qualifying examination before appointment, how does he account for some of them passing accounts in which law, engineering, and other expenses are mixed beyond the possibility of subsequent segregation; whether the Local Government Board will in future appoint as auditors only duly-qualified men after competitive examination; and whether the Board will require an intelligent annual analysis of the accounts of local bodies or the keeping of the accounts in such a way that information useful to the public can be obtained when required.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As regards the qualifications prescribed for candidates for auditorships under the Local Government Board, I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a Question on the subject asked by the hon. Member for Kilkenny on the 9th instant. The Board are satisfied that their existing orders are quite sufficient for the purpose referred to in the last part of the Question.

Tenders for Performance of Legal Work.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will explain why the auditors of the Local Government Board for Ireland do not enforce the law of lowest tender for performance of the legal work as of the other public works of local governing bodies; if he is aware that in most cases in which an annual payment is made to a solicitor all real legal work is paid for according to scale in addition, being double payment out of the rates; and whether local bodies and auditors will be instructed to adhere in future to either one system or the other, subject in either case to the common requirement of advertising for tenders and accepting the lowest.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member presumably refers to the law relating to the acceptance of tenders for the execution of public works, but this law does not appear to apply to the legal work of local bodies. The Local Government Board are not aware of any foundation for the allegation that double payment is made for such legal work. There is no statutory provision which would enable the Board to issue instructions as suggested.

Purchase of Townland of Toames, County Cork.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the townland of Toames, parish of Macloneigh, on the estate of Lord Bandon, County Cork, has been vested in the tenants by the Estates Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The advances for the purchase of these lands have not yet been sanctioned by the Estate Commissioners, and, until this has been done, the lands cannot be vested in the tenants.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Submarines.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many submarines are to be laid down under this year's Estimates.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): It is not in the public interest to state for the present what the number is.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: When does the right hon. Gentleman expect to be in a position to give the information?

MR. McKENNA: Not this session, but I should hope early next year.

New Destroyers.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the purchase of the two destroyers to replace the "Gala" and the "Tiger" has been completed; and can he give particulars of their dimensions, their speed, and their names.

MR. McKENNA: The purchase of the vessels in question has not been completed.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: When will it be?

MR. McKENNA: That does not depend on the Admiralty. It depends on the trials proving satisfactory.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is the House to understand that the new "Tigers" will possess to the full the destroying qualities of the abandoned boats or beasts? Will they be equally effective?

MR. McKENNA: I hope so.

Rosyth.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what progress has been made with the work at Rosyth.

MR. McKENNA: Tenders for the Rosyth contract were invited on 23rd October; they are to be sent in on 22nd December.

H.M.S. "Bulwark."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty upon what date did the "Bulwark" leave Sheerness after repairs; whether she then joined the Channel Fleet; or, if not, where did she go, for what purpose, and by whose orders.

MR. McKENNA: The "Bulwark" left Sheerness on 2nd October and, under Admiralty orders, proceeded to Devonport to embark part of her crew, calling en route at Portsmouth; she arrived at Devonport on 3rd October and proceeded on 6th October to Berehaven to adjust gun-sights, and thence, on 15th October, to Portland to carry out battle practice. The adjustment of gun-sights was proposed by the Commander-in-Chief, Channel Fleet, and approved by the Admiralty: the battle practice was ordered by the Commander-in-Chief.

Refitting of Battleships.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether H.M.S. "Irresistible" "Swiftsure," "Triumph," "New Zealand," "Hampshire," and "Roxburgh" were refitting on 8th November; whether he has any official information to show what on that date was the estimated time required to get each of these vessels to sea; if so, what was the estimate for each vessel, respectively; and whether he can state which of these vessels have now completed refit, and the respective dates of completion.

MR. McKENNA: The reply to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. With regard to the second part of the Question, I am not clear whether the hon. Member wishes to know the estimated date at which these vessels could be completed for sea in an emergency, or whether he wishes to know the date at which they are in the ordinary course to have their refit completed. The dates on the former basis I am not, in the public interest, prepared to give; on the latter basis, the dates are as follows:—"Irresistible," taken in hand 29th September, 1908; date for completion, 12th December, 1908. "Swiftsure," taken in hand 5th October, 1908; date for completion 30th November, 1908. "Triumph," taken in hand 7th September, 1908; date for completion, 26th December, 1908. "New Zealand," taken in hand 31st August, 1908; date for completion, 12th November, 1908. "Hampshire," taken in hand, 12th October, 1908; date for completion, 5th December, 1908. "Roxburgh," taken in hand, 17th September, 1908; date for completion, 15th December, 1908. With regard to the last part of the Question, the "New Zealand" was completed on 12th November.

Hepburn-on-Tyne Dock.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is the depth of water over the sills at Messrs. R. Stephenson's docks at Hepburn-on-Tyne.

MR. McKENNA: The answer to the hon. Member's Question is, 29 feet over the sill at high-water springs.

MR. FELL: Will there be this depth of water on more than two or three days a fortnight?

MR. McKENNA: I assume the hon. Member correctly describes the high water springs.

Admiralty Granite Contracts.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty considers quotations for granite from foreign and home producers on equal terms.

MR. McKENNA: The answer to the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative.

*Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): In view of the terrible state of unemployment obtaining up and down the country, will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that all Admiralty requisites shall be bought here, the price being reasonable?

Mr. McKENNA: I can give no such undertaking.

H.M.S. "Hindustan."

Mr. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty upon what date the "Hindustan" left Portsmouth after repairing; whether she then joined the Channel Fleet, or, if not, by whose orders and for what purpose was she sent to any other destination; and to what place was she sent.

Mr. McKENNA: The "Hindustan" left Portsmouth on 16th October; she did not join up with the Channel Fleet, but by the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet proceeded to Portland.

Horses for the Territorial Associations.

Earl WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet received reports from the various Territorial Associations stating how many horses there are within their area which would be both suitable and available for the mounted branches of the force in the event of mobilisation.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): Up to the present only two Associations have forwarded Reports as to the number of horses within their area. The horses, however, were not classified. The information required necessarily takes considerable time to secure.

Army Horses.

Earl WINTERTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of horses in the Remount Department and in regiments that there are in excess of actual requirements for the Household Cavalry and Cavalry of the Line at home stations.

Mr. HALDANE: There are no horses in the Remount Department and in regiments in excess of actual requirement for Household Cavalry and Cavalry of the Line at home.

Indian Government Contracts—Fair Wages Clause.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India what are the terms of the Fair Wages Clause in contracts placed by the Indian Government in Great Britain or on the Continent of Europe; and what means are taken to secure its enforcement.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): The "Fair Wages Clause" in contracts given out by the India Office is the same as that contained in other Governwent contracts in this country. When complaint is made to the Department that the clause is not being carried out, an inquiry is made, and if the complaint is substantiated the firm would be compelled to observe the clause.

Liquor Trade in India.

Sir HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Resolution of the Government of India, dated 15th August, 1907, directing that local opinion in regard to the number and sites of liquor shops should be consulted more systematically and recorded more definitely, has been carried into effect in all the provinces of India; whether he can state in how many towns and municipalities local committees have been set up for the purpose of advising the Government upon this subject, and to what extent non-official opinion is represented upon these committees.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State regrets that he is not in possession of the detailed information necessary for a reply to this Question, but he proposes to direct that the three points referred to by my hon. friend should receive special notice in the next annual Excise Report of each Local Government.

Indian Government Purchases in Belgium.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool Everton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the trade union clause providing for rates of wages and hours of labour is included in the contracts made by the India Office, and particularly was any clause protective of wages and hours of labour included in the recent purchases of iron material from Belgian manufacturers.

MR. BUCHANAN: I have just stated in reply to the hon. Member for Darlington, particulars of the "Fair Wages Clause," which is inserted in all our contracts. No clause relating to hours of labour is inserted in contracts made by the India Office.

South Indian Labour Agency in Ceylon.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Ceylon Government subsidises the Indian recruiting agency; and, if so, to what extent.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): Since its establishment in 1904, one quarter of the cost of the South Indian Labour Agency has been contributed by the Ceylon Government. The subsidy for the current year is Rs.12,000. The Report of the Ceylon Labour Commission has recently been received, and we are awaiting the Governor's recommendations on it.

Evictions of Natives in the Transvaal.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that notices of eviction have been served on natives in the Zoutpansberg and other districts of the Transvaal based on a law of 1895, previously stated to have long fallen into disuse; whether, seeing that under Article 7 the eviction of families hitherto permitted to reside on farms has for sanction, in case of continuing or repeated offence, the penalty of flogging on every head of such family so living without a permit, and that by Article 8 coloured persons living with permits on farms are forbidden to leave without three months notice to the occupier and also to the Commissioner, he can inform the House how far it is understood that the revival of the law in question is an alternative to the proposed Natives' Occupation of Lands Bill, of which the withdrawal was announced in the House of Commons; and whether the Government are satisfied that the revived Act will not prove detrimental to the interests of all natives except such as consent to labour on particular farms.

COLONEL SEELY: I have no information on the subject, but inquiry has been made of the Governor by telegram.

Nigerian Spirit Imports.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how much of the gin and other spirits which were imported into Nigeria was imported from Hamburg and other German ports.

COLONEL SEELY: The total declared value of spirits imported into Southern Nigeria in 1907 was £385,505. Of this, spirits to the value of £139,890 were imported from Germany.

State Socialism in Crown Colonies.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state in what other Crown Colonies besides Ceylon the Colonial Government runs its own workshops and undertakes contracts for private parties.

COLONEL SEELY: The arrangement referred to by my hon. friend is by no means unusual.

*MR. REES: May I ask whether State Socialism is or is not good business, and, whether the answer be in the affirmative or in the negative, is it less suitable to Ceylon than to the British Isles and to any other British Possession?

COLONEL SEELY: That is rather a wide and vague question, and I am bound to point out that this is a very modified form of State Socialism.

Wesley College, Colombo.

Mr. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the total cost of constructing the Wesley College at Colombo, built by a contractor, with boarding accommodation for 450 boys, and the Public Works Department estimate for the new Royal College for 350 boys, without boarding accommodation; and the cost per cubic foot, respectively, of the two colleges.

Colonel SEELY: I understand that the cost of the Wesley College was Rs.175,000 without the principal's house, or 43 cents per cubic foot, and that the estimates prepared by the Ceylon Public Works Department for the new Royal College involved a cost of Rs.296,260 without the principal's house, or about 90 cents per cubic foot. The Ceylon Government have, however, given instructions for the preparation of new plans for the Royal College at a cost not exceeding Rs.125,000.

Colombo Graving Dock.

Mr. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Government of Ceylon in November, 1907, accepted proposals submitted by a local firm for the construction of workshops at the graving dock at Colombo; and why the Government cancelled the arrangement on 23rd May, 1908, after the firm had made extensive preparations to carry out the contract.

Colonel SEELY: The Answer to the first part of my hon. friend's Question is in the negative. With regard to the second part, the negotiations broke down because the local firm required the whole available frontage of the harbour.

Ceylon Government Workshops.

Mr. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that dissatisfaction exists in Ceylon at the Government's interference with private enterprise in repairing merchant ships and undertaking other private and public works, and that the competition of the Government workshops is considered very unfair to traders who contribute largely to the revenue of the Colony, whereas the former pay no rates, taxes, or duties on imported materials; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

Colonel SEELY: No representations have been received from Ceylon on the subject. As I informed my hon. friend on 10th November, the Ceylon Government have only proposed to undertake ship-repairing work because they failed after prolonged negotiations to arrive at satisfactory terms with local firms for the provision of the necessary workshops. The answer to the last Question is in the negative.

Orange River Colony Loan.

Captain CLIVE (Herefordshire, Ross): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is the intention of the Government to guarantee the loan for £1,500,000 asked for by the Orange River Colony Government; and whether it is their intention to attach any conditions to the grant of that guarantee.

Colonel SEELY: I am unable to add anything to my reply to a similar Question by the hon. Member for Gravesend on 19th October.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): May I ask the hon. and gallant Gentleman whether he will take care that there are no conditions to the grant of the guarantee which will make it incumbent on the Government to do away with British employees in preference to Orange River Colony employees?

Colonel SEELY: I do not think that implication is merited, and, if I may respectfully say so, I do not think it should be made in this Parliament in reference to a self-governing Colony. But, in any case, the request for the loan has not yet been officially received.

British Passports in Russia.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that Mr. Joseph Edelstein, a well-known and respected citizen of Dublin, was granted a passport, signed by the Secretary of State, to visit Russia and other places abroad, bearing date 20th October, 1908; whether he is aware that the

Russian consuls refused to allow Mr. Edelstein to enter Russian territory, although he produced his British passport; whether he can say under what conditions British or Irish subjects are permitted to visit Russia; on what grounds was Mr. Edelstein refused admission; and what steps he proposes to take to secure due respect from Russia for passports issued under his name.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): A passport, worded in general terms for travelling on the Continent, not specifically for Russia, was issued to Mr. Joseph Edelstein on the date mentioned. I have no information beyond that given in the Question as to the difficulties he encountered in entering Russian territory. British subjects are permitted to visit Russia on the same conditions as the subjects of other countries. The Russian Government retain, as the Governments of other countries do, the right to make regulations respecting the admission of aliens. I have no information as to why Mr. Edelstein was refused admission; but I am quite ready to receive any which is forthcoming, and to inquire into it.

Brigandage in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fresh outbreaks of brigandage in Egypt, and the admission in Sir Eldon Gorst's Report for 1907 of the need for improvements in the existing police system, he will urge upon the Egyptian Government the expediency of establishing a committee of public security, in which experienced natives of the administrative and other classes may take part and suggest new measures.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of the recent occurrence of any events in Egypt which would render the establishment of a committee of public safety necessary or desirable. Sir Eldon Gorst has pointed out that the degree of insecurity prevailing is greatly exaggerated. He has also stated, in his Report, that the effect of the measures taken for the gradual improvement of the present system for dealing with crime will not be apparent for some time to come, and we see no reason for making any further recommendations.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Has not the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to recent reports of brigandage?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not seen the reports. If the hon. Gentleman has any information perhaps he will forward it.

Egyptian Administration.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the refusal to extend the legislative powers of the Legislative Council and General Assembly in Egypt, he will recommend to the Egyptian Government the expediency of appointing a committee to inquire into the working of the judicial, police, educational, and other departments of the administration, with a view to their amendment.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The hon. Member will see from Sir Eldon Gorst's recent Report on Egypt and the Soudan that the questions to which he refers are occupying the serious attention of the Egyptian Government; and I do not think that in the present circumstance any useful purpose would be served by making the particular proposal suggested in the Question.

Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims against Russia.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to give any information in reference to the steamers sunk and destroyed by the Russian Government during the Japanese War; and, if not, what steps he intends to take to enforce the rights of British subjects whose property has been destroyed.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox): My right hon. friend has nothing to add to the Answer he gave to the hon. Member for Boston on the 15th ultimo. Cases in which British subjects are interested, either as owners or underwriters, are still pending before different Russian Courts. His Majesty's Government greatly regret the delay that has occurred in the hearing of these cases, and it has formed the subject of several representations by His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg; but they understand that the Russian Court will now deal with them very shortly.

Conviction of Arthur Jones.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of Arthur Jones, a traveller, who was convicted of stealing a lace scarf and was sentenced at the Middlesex Sessions to six years penal servitude and two years police supervision; and will he say what action he intends to take in the matter.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I have received a petition from the prisoner for a reduction of sentence, but, in view of the character of the offence charged, and of the offences of which he has been previously convicted, I see no reason for interference on my part. It was, and still is, open to the prisoner to apply to the Court of Criminal Appeal.

Flogging Sentences at Northallerton Quarter Sessions.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that at the Northallerton Quarter Sessions the chairman ordered twenty lashes to be administered to a so-called incorrigible rogue, to be given on two separate occasions, the first a week from that day and the other as soon after as the doctor certified that he was fit to receive it; and whether, in view of the Criminal Appeal Act of 1907, which provides for a ten days' grace for appeal, and of the provisions of the Vagrants Acts as to a whipping being inflicted by two instalments, and seeing that this is the first double flogging since Sir M. W. Ridley put a stop to such sentences in 1900, he will say what action he intends to take in the matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am aware of this case. The conviction was for living on the earnings of prostitution, and it was proved that the man had grossly ill-treated the unfortunate woman. He had three previous convictions of the same offence. In accordance with the regular practice of myself and my predecessors, one of the two instalments of corporal punishment has been remitted. The other, consisting of ten lashes, was carried out after the time allowed for appeal had expired, the prisoner having decided not to appeal.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

Mr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether His Majesty's Government recognise the class of political prisoners; whether the suffragists now imprisoned in Holloway were committed under 34 Edw. III., because they refused to find bail; if not, whether he will state the nature of their offence.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The reply to the first Question is that His Majesty's Government is necessarily guided by the law, which does not recognise political motive as giving rise to any claim to special treatment in prison on the part of offenders against the ordinary law. As regards the second, I am advised by the chief magistrate that in requiring the suffragists to find sureties to keep the peace, the magistrates were acting under the general powers vested in them by virtue of their commission. These powers originated in part from the Statute of Edw. III., but the procedure for their exercise has been regulated by Parliament so recently as in the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879.

Mr. COOPER: Is it within the recollection of the right hon. Gentleman that he and the present Prime Minister and the Liberal Party went into the Division Lobby as a protest against the arrest and prosecution of the senior Member for the City of Cork on 1st July, 1889?

*MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this Question.

MR. COOPER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Mrs. and Miss Pankhurst, now imprisoned in Holloway Gaol, were deprived of exercise and put on bread and water because they spoke to one another when they met in the exercise yard.

MR. GLADSTONE: Mrs. and Miss Pankhurst were not put on bread and water. They were both awarded one day's confinement to cell for taking part in a disturbance in the exercise yard. I may add that I have received satisfactory reports of the health of both Mrs. and Miss Pankhurst, and that directions were given on Friday last that they should be allowed to exercise together in the hospital yard without any restrictions as to talking.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Are these ladies wearing their own garments?

MR. GLADSTONE: They are now in the second division.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Would it not be better for exercise if the right hon. Gentleman allowed them to walk outside the prison?

MR. COOPER: Is it not a fact that Mrs. Pankhurst and Miss Pankhurst were put into solitary confinement for one day because the mother and daughter met one morning and spoke, and were reported for doing so by the wardress?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed that there was an offence against the prison rules concerning talking.

MR. COOPER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the suffragists now imprisoned in the second and third class at Holloway Gaol have been required to take exercise with women serving sentences for theft, drink, or soliciting; whether any of the suffragists have refused to exercise with criminals and have been deprived of exercise and placed on bread and water in a punishment cell; and whether, if the suffragists have been allowed to take exercise by themselves, he will state the terms of any instruction issued by the Prison Board to the prison authorities directing them not to require certain female prisoners not to take exercise with criminals.

MR. GLADSTONE: The suffragists now imprisoned at Holloway are in the second division. There are none in the third division. None of them has been required to take exercise with women serving sentences for theft or any other offences, nor have any of them been placed on bread and water, or confined in a punishment cell. The obligation to keep second division prisoners apart from other classes is imposed by the Prison Rules (Rule 232), and does not require any special instructions from the Prison Commissioners.

Books for Prisoners.

MR. COOPER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether no books but a Bible and Prayer Book are allowed to a prisoner committed to gaol in the second or third class during the first month of imprisonment; whether during the second month's imprisonment a second book may be obtained from the prison library, but cannot be changed during the month; whether the prisoners are deprived of all writing materials during the first month's imprisonment, and whether the writing materials supplied in the second month consist of a slate and slate pencil; and whether persons detained because they have refused to find bail come under these regulations.

MR. GLADSTONE: Prisoners of the second division are allowed a library book and books of secular instruction, as well as devotional books, from the beginning of their sentences; those of the third division are allowed books of secular instruction and devotional books from the day of their admission, but are not allowed library books until they enter the second stage, *i.e.*, at the end of twenty-eight days. In the second stage the library book is changed once a week, and in the third and fourth stages twice a week. All prisoners receive slates and slate pencils on admission, but are not allowed other writing materials, except for writing letters to their friends or petitions to the Home Secretary. Female prisoners in the second division have their library books changed at more frequent intervals. Unconvicted prisoners detained in default of finding sureties are, under the Prison Act, 1898, treated in accordance with the rules for the division, whether first or second, in which they are placed under the order of the Court.

*Mr. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman arrange that the third book, in addition to the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, provided for these ladies in gaol shall be Blackstone's "Commentaries on the Laws of England."

French Import Duties on Limes.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMPSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the import duty in France on limes or lemons which are the produce of Spain and the British West Indies respectively.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): Limes and lemons, the produce of Spain, imported into France are dutiable under the "minimum tariff" at the rate of 5 francs per 100 kilograms gross weight. The produce of the British West Indies does not in general enjoy the "minimum tariff" rates on importation into France, and limes and lemons imported therefrom are dutiable under the "general tariff" at the rate of 15 francs per 100 kilograms net weight.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON asked what steps would be taken to get the most favoured nation treatment for British West Indies?

Mr. CHURCHILL asked for notice.

Railway Combines—Investments in Railway Stock.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that more than half the railway stock of the United Kingdom is held in parcels of £500 and under, and that the average return is 3¼ per cent.; and whether in view of these facts, and of the serious results to multitudes of small investors from interference with the rights of the railway companies to make combinations and mutual arrangements, he will take into account and consider their case on each and every occasion on which he is urged by other interests to disapprove or disallow such combinations or mutual arrangements.

Mr. CHURCHILL: If my hon. friend means that half the separate holders of railway stock are holders of stock not exceeding £500, I have no reason to doubt the approximate accuracy of his figures. As regards the last part of the Question, I cannot add to the Answers I gave to his Question of the 11th instant, and to that of my hon. friend the Member for Dudley of the 4th instant.

Working Railway Agreements.

Mr. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the working agreement between the Caledonian and North British Railways has received the sanction of the Railway and Canal Commissioners in accordance with Section 25 of the Railway Clauses Act, 1863, and amending enactments thereof.

The hon. Member had also the following Questions on the Paper:—

To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been called to the action of the Great Central and Great Northern Railway Companies in entering into a working agreement after the matter had been before the Railway and Canal Commissioners, who declined to allow an amalgamation under an old Act of Parliament; and what steps he propose to take in the matter.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade how many applications for working agreements between railway companies have been submitted to the Railway and Canal Commissioners for approval since 1905, and how many such agreements have been ratified.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the agreements to pool receipts now in force between the London and North Western Railway Company and the Midland Railway Company have been sanctioned by the Railway and Canal Commissioners; and, if so, on what date.

MR. CHURCHILL: I will answer the hon. Member's four Questions together. The Reports of the Railway and Canal Commission show that three applications were made to them for the approval of working agreements in the years 1905, 1906, and 1907. Of these three working agreements one was sanctioned and another was sanctioned in part, but the proposed working agreement between the Great Northern and Great Central Railway Companies was, as stated by the hon. Member, not approved. The other Agreements referred to in the Question have not been submitted for the approval of the Railway and Canal Commissioners, but I should explain that Section 25 of the Railways Clauses Act, 1863, does not apply generally to all Agreements between railway companies, but only to such as are made under the provisions of a special Act incorporating Part III. of the Clauses Act in question. I understand that an Agreement between the Great Northern, the Great Central, and the Great Eastern Companies will be submitted for the consideration of Parliament.

MR. WARDLE: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that the agreements which are now in force between the London and North-Western and Midland Railway Companies and the other agreements to which I have referred do not come under the Act of 1863?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir; that is the purport of my Answer.

Imports of German and Belgian Steel and Iron.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in regard to the plates and sheets of iron and steel consigned to this country from Germany and Belgium during the year 1907, he can state the amount of royalty per ton levied in each of the countries named; whether such royalties are paid to the State or the individual; if he can state approximately the royalty per ton levied in this country on similar articles; and, if not, whether he is prepared to obtain such particulars, and have some tabulated.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, I am not able to give the information desired, and I do not think it would be possible to define with precision in the case of particular articles, like those mentioned by the hon. Member, the proportion of the cost of production which may be due to royalties on the raw material.

Unemployed Records.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can recommend, with a view to discovering the genuine unemployed, that a column should be added in the register of applicants on distress committees showing for what reason each man left his employment.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The Regulations already require record papers to be kept, showing as regards each applicant the nature of his last employment and the date and cause of termination of that employment. I will send the hon. Member a copy of the Regulations.

*CAPTAIN FABER: What I want is the reason for leaving the employment of the distress committee. Cannot that be secured?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put down an unstarred Question.

Old-Age Pensions.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is yet in a position to say whether an old-age pension may be given to a woman who is fully qualified to receive a pension but whose husband is in receipt of outdoor Poor Law relief.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The reply is in the negative. I am expecting to receive the opinion of the Law Officers on the point very shortly.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.) asked a further Question.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I shall be obliged to hon. Members if they will postpone Questions on this subject until I am in possession of the definite views of the Law Officers.

Mr. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have already decided that relief given to a husband for the sole use and benefit of his wife disqualifies him and not his wife; and whether, in view of the fact that the proceedings of a number of pension committees are being delayed owing to the need of an authoritative interpretation of the law, he will do his best to expedite an official pronouncement on the subject?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Certainly. The question is practical and, I think, urgent. I will do my best as early as possible.

Distress Committee Areas.

Mr. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any steps are being taken or will be taken to group localities with a population of less than 10,000, in order that a distress committee may be created for the district.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I can only refer my hon. friend to the Answer which I gave on the 13th instant to a similar Question which he put to me.

Mr. CURRAN: Are we to understand that nothing is to be done for any section of the unemployed, in accordance with the scheme laid down by the Prime Minister, where the population is less than 10,000?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Perhaps it may be convenient for me to read my previous Answer: "The Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, does not admit of the grouping of districts with a view to establishing in the grouped area a distress committee who would be enabled to provide or to contribute towards the provision of work for the unemployed. I am afraid, therefore that it would not be practicable to give effect to the object which my hon. friend appears to have in view."

Mr. CURRAN: What we desire to know is whether, in accordance with the scheme set before this House and the country by the Prime Minister for the temporary relief of the unemployed, it is not possible to group the smaller districts so that the committees could cover a certain radius.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Not in that particular way, but in another way. The best plan is by setting up distress committees, of which I have set up a number this week.

Cheshire Roads.

Captain FABER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, looking at the fact that the Cheshire authorities have declared that tar macadam, when once laid down on roads, is only one-fourth the price of ordinary macadam to renovate, he can see his way to advising that the initial expense, which is much greater than that of ordinary macadam, should be provided for out of the Imperial Exchequer, to be repaid by the yearly saving with a view to doing away with the dust nuisance created by motor cars.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I am afraid there is no probability of effect being given to the suggestion of the hon. Member. I may, however, point out that it is the practice of the Local Government Board to sanction loans for laying down roads with tar macadam, and to allow a period of five years for the repayment of the loan. Assuming, therefore, that the view attributed to the Cheshire authorities is correct, it would seem that the local authorities could recoup themselves the additional initial expense within the period of the loan.

Provision for Hungry School Children.

Mr. HENRY (Shropshire, Wellington): I beg to ask the President of the Board of

Education if he will give the number of education authorities that are availing themselves of the provisions of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act; and whether, in view of the existing state of unemployment, he will inform the different education authorities of the desirability of making the necessary arrangements so that during the winter schools may be provided with the required equipment to meet the necessity of feeding children in accordance with the Act.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorks, W.R., Elland): I have no complete statistics as to the number of authorities who have in one way or another taken action under the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, but information is now being collected as to the proceedings of local authorities under the Act during the year ended 31st March, 1908. Seventy authorities have been authorised by the Board under Section 3 of the Act to spend money out of the rates upon the purchase of food. The Board are not empowered by the Provision of Meals Act to make representations to local authorities urging them to adopt its provisions, but shortly after the passing of the Act the Board issued a circular calling the attention of local authorities to their powers under it and to the advantages that might be obtained by exercising them.

School Inspectors' Reports.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if in the next General Report of the Board he will include the inspectors' reports, thus reverting to the practice which in former years was always adopted.

MR. TREVELYAN: For the reasons to which I referred in answer to the right hon. Gentleman's previous Question, I am unable to adopt his suggestion.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the publication of these reports afforded almost the only means by which the general public obtained independent information as to the working of the schools throughout the country? From that point of view will he reconsider this matter?

MR. TREVELYAN asked for notice.

Tuberculin Test at Aberystwyth College.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the attention of the Board has been drawn to the result of recent experiments carried on at the farm attached to the University College of Aberystwyth, when it was found, by the application of the tuberculin test, that 24 per cent. of the milch cows on the dairy farm were suffering from tuberculosis and were disposed of at a serious loss; whether the Board has reason to suppose that tuberculosis exists to the same degree in the country generally; and whether, with a view to stamping out the disease, the Government will pay to the owners the value of cows destroyed as being affected with tuberculosis in any form.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. Such evidence as is available goes to show that a very considerable proportion of animals in dairy herds might be expected to react to the tuberculin test, and a percentage of reaction such as that quoted would probably not to be found to be unusual. The Board as at present advised would not be prepared to undertake operations against tuberculosis in animals on the lines suggested.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Why do the Government take less interest in tuberculosis in England than in Ireland?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am not aware that they do.

MR. LUPTON: Have not these tuberculin tests been proved to be utterly useless?

[No Answer was returned.]

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Why are not the more stringent regulations in Ireland extended to England?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Ireland is not my Department.

Small Holdings in Durham.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many applications under the Small Holdings Act, 1907, have been applied for in the county of Durham; the amount of land obtained and asked for; the number of applications acceded to; and the parts of the county in which the land is situated.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: There have been 350 applications for 6,452 acres and 314 of the applicants are regarded as suitable. A farm of 170 acres at Brafferton, near Darlington, has just been purchased, but it has not yet been divided up into small holdings.

Radnorshire Small Holdings.

CAPTAIN CLIVE (Herefordshire, Ross): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the Radnorshire County Council, after dividing the land acquired by them under the Small Holdings Act into twelve small holdings, have had to let ten of the holdings as by-takes to large farmers, no small holders being found to take them at the rents asked; and if he can say how many other county councils have had the same experience.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): What was the original rent of the farm, and at what rent was it offered to small holders?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am not able to say. The Board are informed by the county council that the facts are not as stated. One of the holdings has been let temporarily till Lady-Day next to an applicant who already held forty-six acres, but none of the other tenants held more than fifty acres including the land held from the council.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: Did not most of the applicants already hold over fifty acres?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No, Sir.

Small Holdings Return.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state, by counties and as a whole, the amount of land let to small holders or agreed to be let from 2nd February, 1909, as compared with the amount of land acquired by county councils for the purpose.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Perhaps the hon. and gallant Member will refer to the reply I gave on the 12th instant to my hon. friend the Member for South Oxfordshire. It is not possible to say how much land will be let from the date mentioned.

Ordnance Survey Maps.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will consider the possibility of depositing in the public library or some other convenient place in each county town the sheets of the 25-inch Ordnance survey of that county, so that applicants for small holdings may be referred to the numbers on the map of the fields that are offered to them, and the necessity of drawing plans in every case be avoided.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The cost of one complete set of the 25-inch maps of England and Wales is over £6,000, and it would not, therefore, be practicable to adopt the suggestion made.

New Forest Roads.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether His Majesty's Commissioners of Woods and Forests have now selected any works of public utility on the Crown estates on which to give extensive additional employment with a view to giving relief to the unemployed in the present emergency, thus showing an example as great landowners, and meeting the recent appeal of the Prime Minister; and, if so, whether he will state where these works are situated, and if they comprise the repair of roads, much wanted and long neglected in the New Forest.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The Commissioners have arranged for some road-making to be specially undertaken during the ensuing winter at Oxshott, near Esher, also at Alice Holt, near Farnham, if the requisite labour is available. Owing to the refusal of the New Forest Rural District Council to pay any part of the expense, a proposal to make a road in the Minstead District, stated to be much required in the interest of the local public, but which would be of only slight advantage to the Crown property, has been abandoned.

Estate Duty Office Clerical Staff.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that all the second division clerks in the Estate Duty Office who have accepted promotion to the first division accompanied with a reduction of salary have been men located in the branch offices in Edinburgh and Dublin, where greater inducements to acceptance prevail than in the head office by reason, *inter alia*, of the larger proportion of superior posts likely to become available to the promoted men; whether the fact has been brought to his notice that, even in these cases, the promotion was only accepted under protest, and in view of the alternative being transfer to a London office and consequent separation from relatives and friends; and whether, seeing that a clerk on promotion will be required to perform superior duties, he will consider the advisability of granting an immediate benefit in salary rather than a benefit deferred for twenty years, and subject to a substantial loss in the meantime.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I am informed that the Answer to the first part of this Question is in the affirmative, inasmuch as no offer of promotion accompanied by reduction of salary has been made to second division clerks in the head office. In each case in which in the branch offices the offer has been made it has been accepted, and I am not aware of any instance in which this has been done under protest. As regards the remainder of the Question I must refer the hon. Member to my previous replies.

Admiralty Second Division Clerks.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that certain second division clerks in the Admiralty, promoted to the first division concurrently with the introduction of the new scale of pay for second division clerks under the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907, were given the benefit of the immediate increase of pay under that Order, he will say in what special circumstances the principle applying not only to the Estate Duty Office but to other offices was in this instance departed from.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The cases of second division clerks in the Admiralty were not parallel to the others mentioned, *e.g.*, those in the Estate Duty Office. In the latter case the conditions of promotion were settled before the passing of the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907. The readjustment of salaries under Clause 6 of that Order was intended to apply to second division clerks remaining such and was given in consideration of their accepting the reduced maximum of salary also provided for in the same Order. It would have been unjustifiable to allow the clause to be used merely for the purpose of increasing initial salaries in the case of the Estate Duty Office and other Departments where not only is there no reduction of maximum but there are prospects of promotion to a higher class. The second division clerks in the Admiralty, on the other hand, elected to come under the new scale before the question of their promotion arose; and when they were afterwards promoted exceptionally for special merit, and not in accordance with any pre-determined scheme, it was not considered equitable to require them to enter at a salary less than their readjusted salaries.

Customs Statistical Department—Overtime.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the amount of overtime done in the Statistical Department of His Majesty's Customs, he will abolish all Saturday overtime, and afford facilities for as many men as is consistent with public business to leave at 1.30 p.m.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I have looked into this matter very carefully. It appears to be impossible, in view of the public demand for information as to Trade Returns at the end of every month being supplied at the earliest possible moment, to do without overtime. But I think it may be reduced, and I am considering steps to be taken at once to that end.

Tobacco Growing in Scotland.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, as tobacco used to be grown for profit in the county of Roxburgh, he has made any regulations to encourage the experimental growing thereof; whether he will consider the expediency of making an allowance in experimental cases in respect of the duty for the time being; and whether he is in a position to state what Excise duties will be imposed on tobacco in Scotland, manufactured or unmanufactured; and what will be the cost of a licence to manufacture tobacco in Scotland.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I may refer my hon. friend to the replies given by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 27th ultimo to my hon. friend the Member for Sutherland, and on the 28th ultimo to my hon. friend himself, in which he indicated the present position in regard to the cultivation of tobacco in Scotland.

In answer to a further Question by Sir John Jardine,

Mr. HOBHOUSE said no application had yet been received from Scotland for permission to grow tobacco.

Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the number of applications for pensions received already exceed the total number of pensions anticipated in the figures placed before Parliament on the passing of the Act.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: The total number of applications received up to 24th October was 562,171. No estimate was made of the probable number of applications, but the number of original pensioners was estimated by my right hon. friend in the course of the Second Reading debate before the introduction of the sliding scale, at 572,000. The adoption of the sliding scale was expected to raise the total to well over 600,000. On the other hand it was not expected that the full number would come on to the list of pensioners until some time after the beginning of the year 1909.

Mr. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the pension officers are instructed to regard a certain portion of the sum paid by a son or daughter for board and lodgings to an aged parent as profit, and to take it into account as income received by the parent, and whether, if the pension officers have such instructions, these instructions entitle them to take 2s. as profit to the parent out of a total sum of 8s. a week paid for board and lodging for an adult daughter.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Pension officers have instructions to regard a portion of the sum paid by an adult son or daughter to an aged parent for board and lodging as part of the means of the parent only where profit actually arises and to the extent of such profit. Each case has to be considered upon the facts and the final decision rests, of course, with the pension committee, subject to appeal to the Local Government Board. The proportion (if any) of a payment of 8s. a week by an adult daughter which might be regarded as profit in any particular case would depend upon the standard of comfort in the household and the cost of living in the locality in which the case occurred.

Mr. SNOWDEN: Does the hon. Gentleman consider that any decent standard of comfort can be secured for 6s. a week?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: 8s., not 6s.

Mr. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): How is the standard of comfort for the home arrived at?

MR. HOBHOUSE: By a consideration of the circumstances of the family.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer why the financial instructions of the Treasury to pension committees and sub-committees, which were laid upon the Table on 16th October, have not been printed; why the order to print these instructions which was given on 16th October was withdrawn on 19th October; and whether these instructions may now be printed for the information of the House.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The financial instructions issued by the Treasury on 20th August for the guidance of pension committees and sub-committees are not "regulations" within the meaning of Section 10 (3) of the Old-Age Pensions Act, and could not, therefore, be laid before the House under that Act. It was, however, intended to present them by Command of His Majesty. On this being explained to the authorities of the House, the order to print was discharged, as the House does not give the order to print Command Papers. The printing of the Instructions as a Command Paper has been delayed because it was expected that they would at once be superseded by amended instructions, but the revision, the scope of which has since been widened, will take longer than was anticipated. They are, therefore, being circulated this week, for the information of the House, in the form in which they were originally issued.

MR. PIKE PEASE: When shall we have these financial instructions?

MR. HOBHOUSE: Within the next week.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Why are they printed as a Command Paper while the instructions to pension officers are withheld from the knowledge of the House?

MR. HOBHOUSE: The instructions to the officers are confidential as between the Department and its servants.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer under what authority the Treasury have called upon the clerk to the appointing council to perform duties and to correspond with the Treasury under the Old-Age Pensions Act; whether any provision exists for remunerating such clerk, and, if not, how it is proposed to remunerate him; and whether instructions of the Treasury, as distinguished from regulations under the Act, have any validity or binding force.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The duty of accounting for the expenses of pension committees falls upon the appointing councils under Regulation 25, and the instructions were addressed to the clerk to the appointing council as the responsible officer of the council. No provision is made in the Old-Age Pensions Act for any expenses incurred by the appointing councils, and if the council should think it necessary to assign to the clerk any special remuneration in respect of this duty, such remuneration would be payable out of the council's fund. The Treasury Financial Instructions have validity only in so far as they determine under Section 10 (4) of the Act the amount which may be charged to moneys provided by Parliament on account of the expenses of pension committees and the conditions subject to which amounts advanced to meet such expenses are to be repaid. The present arrangements will remain in force only until the approaching annulment of Regulation 25 takes effect.

MR. PIKE PEASE: But is it not the fact that there is no provision for the remuneration of these clerks?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I have dealt with that in my Answer.

MR. SNOWDEN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that at the rate at which the claims for old-age pensions are now being settled a considerable number of the claims already made will be undecided on 1st January; and can he give an assurance that all persons claiming before the end of November shall, if their claims are finally established, not lose any weekly pension on account of administrative delays.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend's information is that very good progress is being made, and he sees no reason, as matters at present stand, for thinking that a considerable number of the claims already made will be undecided by 1st January.

Mr. SNOWDEN: Will the hon. Gentleman answer the latter part of the Question?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: That is a matter for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I will consult my right hon. friend upon it.

Lord R. CECIL: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in London, at any rate, there is not the least prospect of the pensions being adjudicated upon and the pension-books delivered before 1st January?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: That is not the information which reaches the Chancellor of the Exchequer from the responsible Department, though it may be the opinion of the noble Lord.

Lord R. CECIL: It is an opinion founded upon information

Customs Superintendents.

Mr. SNOWDEN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, seeing that out of a classification of twenty-six superintendents in the Customs service only eight have been promoted since the beginning of the year 1899; that some of them have been for years marking time at their maximum salary; that through changes which took place in 1899 some are actually receiving a smaller income to-day than they were ten years ago, though performing the same duties; that 69 per cent. of the superintendents entered the service by open competition and have spent an average of about sixteen years in charge of the smaller ports, he will explain why there is withheld from them a reasonable flow of promotion and less generous treatment than is shown to any other grade in the Department who entered the service under similar conditions.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I will endeavour to get the information if the hon. Member will put the Question down again to-morrow.

British Investments Abroad.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of income received from capital invested abroad as shown by the Income-Tax Returns for each of the separate financial years from 1900–1901 to 1907–8; and if he can give similar figures showing the amount of income remitted abroad to persons who have capital invested in this country.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Statistics of that portion of the income received from British capital invested abroad which can be identified from the Income-Tax Returns for the years 1900–1 to 1906–7 are to be found on page 183 of the 51st Report of the Board of Inland Revenue [Cd. 4226]. For 1907–8 the figures are not yet available. I may also draw the hon. Member's attention to the text on pages 182 and 183 of the Report, where it is explained that a large amount of income from abroad cannot be identified.

Foreign Investors in British Securities.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the amount of Consols and other Government stocks held by foreign investors or by persons resident abroad.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: No, Sir. The information is not available.

Mr. FELL: Cannot it be obtained from the Income-Tax Returns?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am informed it is not available. I cannot go beyond that.

Civil Service Superannuation.

Mr. SNOWDEN: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when the promised Bill dealing with the superannuation of civil servants will be introduced; and, if it is not possible to pass it this session, will the Government introduce it early next year, and endeavour to pass it into law without delay.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I must refer the hon. Member to my right hon. friend's reply to the hon. Member for Wolverhampton West on the 5th instant, in which he expressed the hope that the Bill may be introduced next session.

Edinburgh Gas Commissioners' Pensioners.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has any knowledge concerning the Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners who have given notice to their pensioners that they will reduce their pensions from 10s. per week to 8s. per week in order that they many receive the full 5s. per week from the Government; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

MR. HOBHOUSE: Under their Provisional Order of 1902 the Edinburgh and Leith Corporations Gas Commissioners are authorised to grant allowances to aged and disabled employees, the amount of such allowances being left in the absolute discretion of the Commissioners, subject to the proviso that it shall not exceed one-half the amount of the wage paid to the employee at the time of his retirement or disablement. My right hon. friend is informed that the Commissioners have now reduced the allowances of five or six of their beneficiaries, who are over seventy years of age, from 10s. to 8s. a week, and in one other case from 8s. 6d. to 8s. a week, so as to enable the men to obtain the full pension of 5s. a week from the Government. The Commissioners appear to be acting within their rights in the matter.

Motor Speeds in Scotland.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland will he say under what Act of Parliament county council authorities Scotland have powers to reduce the speed of motor cars in villages to ten miles per hour; and whether he has granted powers of local self-government to county councils relating to the speed of motor traffic.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): There is no Act conferring the powers referred to in the first part of the Question. The Secretary for Scotland has no power to proceed as suggested in the second part of the Question.

Irish Civil Service.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will give the names of all persons receiving £100 a year or more out of Sub-head A, Vote 32, Class 2, of Civil Service Estimates, stating the amount paid yearly in each case and the nature of the service for which it is paid.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I will, with the hon. Member's permission, circulate with to-night's Votes a tabular statement containing the information which he requires.

Horse-Breeding in Ireland.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) what sum, if any, is annually spent out of Imperial funds in improving or encouraging the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle, respectively, in Ireland.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The public money spent on improving the breed of horses and cattle in Ireland comes from the Endowment Fund of the Department and from local rates raised by the county councils. The respective amounts spent are, approximately: From the Department's Endowment Fund, £7,000 on horse-breeding, and £10,000 on cattle-breeding; from the rates raised by county councils for purposes of agriculture and technical instruction, £10,000 for live stock schemes including cattle and horses. It is not clear whether, in the sense in which the hon. Member means the expression "Imperial funds" to be used, that this description applies to the Endowment Fund of the Department. The Endowment Fund consists mainly of Ireland's share of the beer and spirit money which in England, Wales, and Scotland, is given directly to county councils for agricultural and technical instruction, the remainder of the Irish Church Temporalities Fund and the equivalent of the salaries of abolished Irish judgeships. That fund, moreover, is not made available in Ireland for the local authorities until they raise a rate themselves in aid of agriculture and technical instruction.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Has any of this endowment been spent on the prevention of cattle-driving in Ireland ?

MR. MOONEY (Newry): In view of the intimation that a new fund will be established in England, may I ask whether the fact that Ireland has already devoted to horse-breeding a share of the Government grant to county councils, which in England and Scotland has been applied to other purposes, will be allowed to militate against Ireland's getting a fair proportion of the new fund ?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department will not lose sight of the claims of Ireland.

Dublin Crown Jewels.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the value of the Crown jewels stolen from Dublin Castle last year, and explain why the Irish Government and the Dublin police authorities have not yet held an open sworn investigation into that particular theft; whether he is aware of the belief prevalent in Ireland that the Government know the thief and do not desire to expose or punish him; and, if the Government desire to remove this impression, whether they will take the course of disproving it by instituting an open sworn investigation with as litle delay as possible.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I am unable to state what was the value of the jewels. I understand that opinions differ widely on the subject. As regards the remainder of the Question I have nothing to add to the numerous replies which I have already given. I refer in particular to my reply to the hon. Member for St. Pancras East on 1st June last.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state who was responsible, at the time the Crown jewels were stolen from Dublin Castle, for the policing of the building from which those jewels were stolen.

MR. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for North Armagh on 2nd July last.

Evicted Tenants—Case of Mrs. Riggs.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of the evicted tenant, Mrs. Riggs, seeing that her evicted farm is untenanted and is neither demesne nor a home farm, and that, though in a wretched condition, she will take no other, he will ask the Estates Commissioners to reconsider her case and reinstate her in her old farm under the compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act.

MR. BIRRELL: I have nothing to add to my reply to a Question on this subject asked by the hon. Member on 15th May last.

Irish Ranch Land.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with his knowledge of the desire prevailing in twenty-two counties of Ireland for the distribution of ranch land, of the people's ability to leave it derelict if not distributed, and of the cost and turmoil consequent on that course, his promised Land Bill will apply generally, or only to the western counties, leaving the people of the other counties to their own resources.

MR. BIRRELL: I must ask the hon. Member to await the introduction of the Irish Land Bill. I cannot undertake to deal with the matter piecemeal.

Ballylassan Cattle-drive.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a cattle-drive took place on 8th November last, when a number of cattle and sheep were driven from a grazing farm at Ballylassan, County Mayo; whether he can state if all the animals have been recovered; how many arrests have been made in connection with the outrage; what sentences, if any, have been passed; and what steps the Executive propose to take to prevent further occurrences of a similar nature.

MR. BIRRELL: A cattle-drive took place at Ballyglass on the date mentioned. All the animals were recovered. No arrests have been made. The police are taking every precaution to prevent a further occurrence of the kind.

Ballinameen Cattle-drive.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a cattle-drive took place on 8th November last, when twenty head of cattle were driven from a grazing farm held by Mr. John Robinson, at Ballinameen, near Boyle, County Roscommon; whether he can state if all the animals have been recovered; how many arrests have been made in connection with the outrage; what sentences, if any, have been passed; and what steps the Executive propose to take to prevent further occurrences of a similar nature.

MR. BIRRELL: Fifteen cattle were driven from Mr. Robinson's farm on the date in question. They have all been recovered. The police have not been able to make any arrests, but they are endeavouring by every possible means to prevent a repetition of the offence.

Colthurst Estate, Ballyvourney.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the year 1906 the Estates Commissioners addressed a public letter to the senior hon. Member for the city of Cork, to the effect that when any tenant or tenants on an estate refused to sign purchase agreements on the terms agreed upon by the general body of tenants, alleging special reasons why they should be exceptionally treated, the Commissioners would order a special inspection and inquiry into their complaints; whether this implied that such tenants would get the benefit of the special inspection and valuation of an estates inspector; was the case of Mrs. Twomey, of Kippagh, on the Colthurst estate, Ballyvourney, County Cork, specially inquired into in July, 1906, by Estates Inspector Lapdell, and can he state the recommendations contained in this gentleman's report; was the same case subsequently inquired into by Mr. Carroll, estates inspector, in the present year; and, seeing that, in accordance with the public undertaking of the Estates Commissioners, there were two inspections of Mrs. Twomey's holding, and having regard to the fact that she holds as a non-judicial tenant, will he explain why it is now proposed to exclude her compulsorily from the sale of this estate, unless she agrees to purchase on terms which would compel her to pay an exorbitant and impossible annuity, and why she will not get the benefit of the special valuation of her holding.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in the letter referred to they stated that where a landlord asks to have a portion of a property declared an estate, omitting certain holdings on the ground that the tenants are unwilling to buy, it is their practice to inquire as to the causes of the omission and the reasonableness of the terms offered to and refused by the tenants. The inspector's visit to the property in 1906 had reference only to turbary, but when the property was being inspected this year the inspector inquired into the case of Mrs. Twomey and the other tenants who have not agreed to purchase. As Mrs. Twomey has not signed a purchase agreement she cannot be included in the sale.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of tenants on the estate of Sir George Colthurst, Ballyvourney, did not claim from the Estates Commissioners a special inspection and valuation of their holdings, alleging that so far as they were concerned the terms offered to the general body of tenants would not meet the equities or circumstances of their cases, and that the Estates Commissioners officially informed the hon. Member for Mid Cork on more than one occasion that the special inspection asked for would be granted; will he explain why it is now proposed to deny these tenants, after over two years waiting, the benefit of any inspection or valuation; and is he aware that threatening notices have been served on them by the agents of the property with the connivance of the Estates Commissioners that unless they sign agreements immediately they will be excluded from the sale.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that certain tenants on this estate have declined to purchase on the terms agreed to by the vendor and the remainder of the tenants, some hundreds in number. The cases of the tenants who decline to purchase were fully inquired into by the Commissioners' inspector when he visited the property. The Commissioners have decided to allow the purchases already agreed upon to proceed, and the remaining holdings can be dealt with subsequently as a separate estate when the owner and the tenants come to terms.

Crookenden and Casey Estate, Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners communicated to the tenants or to anyone that the owners of the Crookenden and Casey estate had accepted their offer since 7th July; have the owners of this estate attempted to levy for judgments and old arrears since 7th July; and will he say if the acceptance of the offer by the owners of this estate affects the entire estate, from what day will the purchase agreements run, and when will they be completed.

MR. BIRRELL: The offer of the Estates Commissioners was only accepted on 19th October, since when they have informed any of the tenants or their advisers who inquired that the offer has been accepted. The Commissioners understand that the sheriff recently attempted to execute decrees which had been in his hands since the spring. The offer relates to the entire property except the Post Office, Courthouse, and Market House. The purchase agreements cannot be completed until the requirements of Section 6 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, have been complied with.

Thomastown Estate, Meath.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired or agreed to purchase untenanted land on the Thomastown estate, County Meath, and, if so, what is the acreage thereof; and will the Estates Commissioners in dealing with this untenanted land consider the claims of the evicted tenants in the union of Oldcastle, County Cavan, in which union this estate is situated, as very little land is available in County Cavan under the Evicted Tenants Act.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have notified in the *Dublin Gazette* their intention of acquiring compulsorily under the Evicted Tenants Act, 170 acres of untenanted land on the estate in question. The applications from those persons in the union of Oldcastle who come within the provisions of the Act will receive due consideration in the distribution of the lands.

Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the name of the firm to which has been entrusted the construction of the new modern whistling buoy for Strangford Bar; on what date did the work begin; is a duplicate being made at the same time; what will the total cost be; and whether it will be defrayed out of light dues collected by the Board of Trade from vessels bound inwards passing that point.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that this whistling buoy will not be constructed by a single firm, but that different parts will be made by about a dozen different firms, the apparatus being completed at the Commissioners' workshops. They state that the preparation of drawings and specifications was commenced on 12th August last, the date when they received the formal sanction of the Board of Trade to the adoption of the Willson type of buoy. A duplicate buoy will be provided at the same time, and the total cost is estimated at £1,000 for each buoy. This will be met out of the General Lighthouse Fund, and not by a special light due in respect of the buoy.

The Tuberculosis Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is proposed by the Government to extend the scope of the Tuberculosis Bill to England and Scotland; and, if not, will steps be taken to prevent poor persons suffering from the disease in England and Scotland being sent to Ireland to be a burden on the rates.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I am not in a position to make any statement as to the extension of the scope of this Bill to England and Scotland. The hon. Member's concluding inquiry opens up a large question with regard to the Law of Settlement which at present applies to England and Scotland but not to Ireland. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary has, I am informed, expressed the intention of considering that question in connection with contemplated legislation for the reform of the Poor Laws next year.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Why should people living in Ireland be allowed to cross to England in order to escape the net of the Bill?

[No Answer was returned.]

Economy of Parliamentary Time.

MR. HENRY (Shropshire, Wellington): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will consider taking the necessary steps, by a resolution or otherwise, for providing that Bills that may have passed the Committee, and of which the subsequent stages are unable to be proceeded with during the present session, that the Report and Third Reading may be taken in the following session without having again to pass the First and Second Readings and be dealt with in Committee.

MR. ASQUITH: This is a matter as to which great difference of opinion exists among persons of authority and experience, and I cannot as at present advised give my hon. friend the assurance for which he asks.

Regulation of Clubs.

*MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government can see their way to put down Amendments to a clause in Part IV. of the Licensing Bill which affects clubs, for limiting the hours in which intoxicating liquor shall be supplied to members or their guests in registered clubs, and imposing a minimum age-limit upon the admission of new members to registered clubs.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think after the full discussion which this part of the Bill received in Committee that the Government would be justified in putting down Amendments in the sense suggested by my hon. friend at this stage.

*MR. CLOUGH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he cannot, at this, the eleventh hour, introduce into the Bill the very modest recommendation of the Royal Commission that there should be a minimum age-limit of eighteen years for membership of clubs where intoxicating liquors are supplied?

MR. ASQUITH: I am not at all hostile to the recommendation myself, but it is not desirable to introduce fresh Amendments at this stage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think some restriction of hours may be in the interests of real temperance reform?

MR. ASQUITH: That is a matter of opinion. The question put to me was whether the Government would put Amendments down. I have replied to that.

Rosyth.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, now that the Government have adopted a policy of encouraging local authorities to contract loans, he will reconsider a former declaration on the part of the Government and issue a loan for the completion of the works at Rosyth.

MR. ASQUITH: His Majesty's Government see no occasion for adopting the course proposed by the hon. and gallant Member.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: Why do the Government consider it sound finance to raise loans for the making of ornamental ponds and for similar purposes, and unsound finance to raise loans for the construction of naval works?

MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Member is very imperfectly acquainted with the facts. The policy of the Government is to complete the works at Rosyth at the earliest practicable moment. Once the contract is let the payment of the whole cost is guaranteed, the total having been sanctioned by Parliament; and there was no reason even for considering the question of dealing with the matter by loans.

English Education Bill.

LORD R. CECIL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Amendments to the Education Bill necessary to carry out the recent pledges of the Minister of Education will be placed upon the Paper.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): May I also ask the Prime Minister when the Government Amendments to the Education Bill will be placed on the Paper.

MR. ASQUITH: A statement on this matter will be made on behalf of the Government possibly to-morrow and at latest on Thursday.

Ladybank Councillors' Grievance.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware of the circumstances under which six employees of the North British Railway Company who had been elected to the Ladybank Town Council, Fife, have had to resign from the council owing to pressure brought to bear upon them by their employers; and whether he proposes taking any action for safeguarding the rights of citizenship of the employees of railway companies and other large industrial concerns.

MR. ASQUITH: It is understood that the North British Railway Company require their servants to devote themselves exclusively to the company's service, and do not consider that membership of a town council is consistent with this requirement. The matter is not one in which any Department of the Government has authority to intervene.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Does the limitation apply to the period when the men are not on duty?

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot say.

MR. KEIR HARDIE intimated that if necessary, in order to secure the removal of this regulation he would oppose any Bill promoted by the company in Parliament.

GRAND COMMITTEE PROCEDURE.

LORD R. CECIL inquired what steps the Government proposed to take to secure the attendance of a Law Officer at the proceedings on the Housing Bill, in view of what was stated the other day and in view of the fact that no Law Officer had attended that day.

MR. ASQUITH: I think I must have notice of that Question. What the means at the disposal of the Government are for securing the attendance of a Law Officer is one of the most difficult problems of administration with which I am acquainted.

MR. LUPTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman not to let the Law Officers practise in the Courts, but to let them serve Parliament, which requires their assistance?

MR. ASQUITH: I can assure my hon. friend that we require their assistance in the Courts quite as much as we do here.

NURSES REGISTRATION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 370.]

COMPANIES CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 371.]

NEW BILL.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK (PUBLIC TRUSTEE) BILL.

"To amend the Post Office Savings Bank Acts, 1861 to 1908, with respect to deposits by the Public Trustee," presented by Mr. Sydney Buxton; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 372.]

LICENSING BILL.

As amended, further considered.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that in moving the omission of Clause 10 he wished to express his satisfaction that they had that day something more like sufficient time to discuss what he thought was the second great injustice of the Bill. Yesterday they had only three hours and a half to discuss the time-limit and local veto, but that day they had six hours and a half in which to deal with the very important question of compensation. He wanted to deal with Clause 10 quite generally and to suggest that the provisions for compensation contained in the clause were by no means just and adequate. The question was dealt with by giving for a house dispossessed so many years purchase of the annual value as ascertained under the Bill. The first question was as to how many years purchase of the annual value were they going to give? With regard to the number given under this clause he had always admitted that the number of years purchase must be determined to some extent by the principle of the time-limit, and when once they had admitted time-limit into the Bill it was not logically wrong to limit the number of years purchase by reference to the time-limit imposed, but, speaking for himself, he could not accept in any shape or form the principle of the time-limit. He did not look upon the position of a licensee as that of a man who had nothing but a mere hope or expectation of a renewal of his licence. He had always held that he had a legal and equitable right to renewal, subject, of course, to certain conditions which were now fully understood. It was the law of the land that the renewal of a licence could not be refused except after notice given to the licensee, except on evidence given against him on oath, and except by a decision which must be founded upon legal principles, for the licensee was allowed to appeal against an adverse decision. The moment they allowed an appeal against refusal, they admitted that there were some principles by which a refusal ought to be guided. He wished to enter his protest against the view that the actual, legal, and moral rights of a licensee could be taken away by any system of time-notice. He had said that so far as regarded the number of years purchase of the annuity the Bill was not it logical having regard to Clause 3, but he wanted on this point to raise the question of what was the meaning of the Amendment put down by the Government adding three years to the number of years purchase. Why three years? The Government had given in addition to the fourteen years reduction period a further period of seven years during which monopoly value did not take effect, and yet, in estimating compensation for the purpose of this clause, they only took a further period of three years. The effect of so doing was that instead of buying a man up on the basis of his being entitled to twenty-one years renewal, they bought him up on the basis of seventeen years, or rather sixteen years, viz., thirteen years balance of the reduction period, and three years additional allowed by the Government Amendment. He quite appreciated that in giving the extra seven years they were still allowing the licence to be taken away by the justices, or by a local veto resolution, but he would like to know on what basis the calculation of three years was arrived at. He thought it highly improbable that as regards certain districts a prohibitory resolution would be passed within the seven years, yet the Government's estimate was that in every district the chances of it were so great that they gave a man rather less than one-half of the actual value of the extended period. It must be nothing more than an arbitrary figure put down for the purposes of discussion. There was another point. Why was it that if a licence was refused in the fourteen years they gave the man compensation, but if it was refused during the following period of seven years they gave him nothing at all? This right to renewal was at all events a substantial one during the further seven years, and yet he was to have no compensation. They were not giving him a further seven years run at all, but simply the chance of the seven years run without compensation. In the next place the number of years purchase of the annual value had reference, not to the real annual value, but to the annual value as estimated under this clause, which was by deducting from the Schedule A value of the house as licensed, the Schedule A value of the house as unlicensed. He pressed upon the Government that that was not a fair basis of assessment for the purposes of compensation. Schedule A value did not rest on valuation. It rested entirely upon the opinion of an official who had perhaps some thousands of houses to value, and whose method of valuation might be different in one place from what it was in another, and they could not fairly take that man's rough estimate of value, for it was nothing else, as the basis on which compensation for refusal could be put. It had been said in that House before that the methods of assessment differed in different unions, and to say that throughout the country that varying basis of assessment should be taken as the foundation for ascertaining on what principle compensation for the actual deprivation of profits should be based was, he thought, to lay down a basis which was vague and uncertain and arbitrary. On the Government's own showing it was not a right basis. He was glad to see the Under-Secretary for the Home Department in his place, because he thought he had at different periods laid down different rules with regard to the effect of Schedule A value, as to whether it included goodwill, that was, local goodwill, or not. When he was dealing with the question of monopoly value, *i.e.*, the amount to be paid by the licensee when he obtained a new licence, he said that Schedule A did not include goodwill. He said there had been much misunderstanding as to the monopoly value to be taken at the end of the time-limit, and that the monopoly value did not include goodwill. If that was right, then, as monopoly value was to be ascertained by reference to the assessment under Schedule A, it followed that the Schedule A assessment did not include goodwill. But when they came to compensation the Government took exactly the opposite view. It had been stated in the House by the Under-Secretary on behalf of the Government that—

> "The goodwill attaching to the premises was unquestionably included in Schedule A."

In each case they were dealing with the same goodwill, and he wished to know if the Government considered that that was included in the Schedule A valuation or not. One day the Government said it was, and the next day they declared that it was not. Which was right? This was a matter which affected the whole amount of compensation to be paid and they ought to have a clear understanding as to what the view of the Government was on this point. His own view was that local goodwill in the case of a public-house ought to be included in Schedule A valuation, but that in practice it was often omitted. Public-houses stood in quite a different position from any other trade premises, because they could not remove a public-house business. A licence was attached to the premises, and if the licence was refused they could not remove the business to other premises. The goodwill was therefore attached to the premises, and if so the Schedule A valuation ought to include goodwill. As a matter of fact in some cases it did, and in others it did not. Many valuers refused to put local goodwill into Schedule A, but others included the whole or some part of it, and certain rough and ready rules were adopted. If they took Schedule A as the basis of compensation the effect would be that in some cases the landlord would not, on the licence being refused, get the value of his local goodwill, but in others the State would take as the monopoly value the value of the goodwill, and in some cases the actual value of the buildings. He would put a case in point to the House. Supposing the owner of a public-house spent £1,000 upon improvements of his premises for the purposes of a public-house. They all knew that the following year the assessment of those premises would go up, and the Schedule A value would increase. That would not come into the account as unlicensed value, but it came into the licensed value. Therefore, in the monopoly value that owner would have to pay upon the improvements he had himself effected. Consequently, they would be taking from that man the actual value of the money he had spent upon improvements. Under this clause, by taking Schedule A as their basis they would be compensating the licensee upon terms which would often give him nothing for the local goodwill of his premises. His first point was that the number of years purchase was wrong, and secondly, the monopoly value was ascertained upon an illogical basis. The only remedy suggested for the grievance he had put was that the licensee could get his assessment raised; or, in other words, they were saying to the persons engaged in this trade that they must get their own assessments raised in order to get fair compensation. A calculation had been made for the purpose of showing what increase of assessment would be required to give licensees something like the sum which they now got as compensation on the basis of market value. On the present assessment of public-houses in London the average was about £260 per annum. In order to give to the licensees such an assessed value as would produce for them on this basis the market value compensation they would have to raise the average assessment from £260 to £700 a house.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): Has the hon. and learned Member made allowance for the additional compensation to be paid in respect of the tenant's interest?

*MR. CAVE: Yes. Those assessments would be raised not because they were worth £700, but because without raising them in that outrageous way they would not get fair compensation. They had only to compare the official figures for London, which fortunately had been got out, to prove this assertion. The figures showed a variation in the number of years purchase given by way of compensation, the compensation amounting in some cases to not more than three years purchase of the assessment and in others to 100 years purchase. The figures were very striking and showed that there was no logical relation between the assessment and the market value. The reason was that those figures were ascertained for a totally different purpose, and they did not hang together. That was necessarily unfair to the people whose money interests would be affected by the Bill. He pressed upon the House if there was still time the advisability of rejecting this false proposal which was founded on an illogical basis, and he invited the Government to go back to the only businesslike basis, and that was the value in the market. Any valuer in ascertaining the market value of a licence, if this Bill became law, would take the provisions of the Bill into account, just as he would do in ascertaining the compensation. He pressed upon the House to do the only fair and logical thing, namely, to abandon this unsound principle of assessment and adopt the market value. Under the clause as it stood, compensation was to be ascertained not by any judicial tribunal but by the Inland Revenue Commission. The Government had been asked whether the Commissioners were bound to give a hearing to the persons affected. Would the Commissioners be obliged to give a hearing to the man whose pocket they were dealing with? If not, this was he thought the only instance that had come before the present Parliament in which they had refused to listen to a man whose living they were actually taking away from him. In the next place, he wished to know if there was going to be any appeal. Under the present law the question of compensation really went through three tribunals. In the first place, they had the justices on the county licensing committee, who listened to arguments and evidence as to the amount of compensation to be paid. If the parties were not satisfied with that they could go to the Commissioners; and if they were still unsatisfied, they could go to the High Court. Under this Bill they had only one tribunal sitting by itself, not bound to hear any evidence or to listen to any argument. He put it to any fair-minded man in the House whether it was right to entrust the fixing of compensation to a tribunal sitting under those conditions. They heard it said sometimes in the House, and very often in the country, that although the Bill might operate hardly upon the owners of licensed houses, at all events the actual licensee would be better off. Anything more untrue than that assertion it was impossible to conceive. There was one thing in favour of the licensee and that was that his compensation was separately assessed. Under the present law he did get compensation for the loss of profits, and must receive not less than one year's profits. It was true that that year's profits was taken from the total value of the premises, while under this Bill, it was to be separately assessed, but although that might be beneficial to the owner it was not necessarily beneficial to the actual tenant, who might not get a penny more. But even if that were to his benefit there was a set-off against it. First of all, the levy to be imposed was to be unlimited, although under the present Act it was limited in amount; secondly, the levy was to be spread over the whole country, so that licensees, when the claims in their own districts had been met, would have to go on contributing for the benefit of others in distant parts of the country; thirdly, there was increased risk of refusal owing to the statutory reduction under Schedule I.; fourthly, a man who had a leasehold interest in his public-house got a compensation which was merely a fraction of its value; fifthly, the amount of compensation was fixed by the Commissioners without hearing an appeal; sixthly, when a licence was refused the house was closed at once without waiting for the time when the compensation was to be paid; seventhly, the assessment of all public-houses would be immediately raised whether they were going to be suppressed or not; and eighthly, there was the time-limit and the monopoly value would be taken at the end of twenty-one years. If these eight points were set up against the very shadowy benefit which would come to the publican by reason of the separate assessment, he thought they would find that the balance weighed heavily indeed against any actual licensee who came within the scope of the clause. He had endeavoured to put his objections shortly and clearly. He hoped that, unless the objections were met, his friends would support him in the division lobby. He begged to move.

*MR. G. D. FABER (York) in seconding the Amendment, said his hon. and learned friend the Member for Kingston had made a transparently clear statement of the objections to the clause. He himself laid no claim to legal learning. All he could lay claim to was general business knowledge, and it was from that point of view that he had the temerity to enter upon the intricacies of the present discussion. The position with which they were face to face under Clause 10 was that the compensation to be paid by the trade to the trade was such a sum as would purchase an immediate annuity at 4 per cent. for the unexpired term of the reduction period, and that figure would have to be arrived at according to the Government method of calculating the value of the annuity. People were under an entire misapprehension if they thought that this clause meant that a certain number of years purchase would be given. It was difficult for the lay mind to follow the annuity process adopted by the Government. People not versed in such matters thought that so many years purchase on the rental value were to be allowed. Nothing of the kind. It was a mere annuity. It was not to be so many years purchase in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but only such a sum as would produce this limited annuity. The second point he wished to make clear was that it was not even a fourteen years annuity, because the annuity was based on the reduction period, and under Clause 44 of the Bill the reduction period did not begin on 5th April next as had been imagined. It did not begin until 1st January, 1910, the whole of 1909 being allowed to the Commissioners to get ready. There would only be a thirteen years reduction period and thirteen years compensation, and, therefore, the utmost that could be obtained under the Bill as originally drawn was such a sum as would at 4 per cent. produce an immediate annuity for thirteen years. The value of the thirteen years immediate annuity was just under ten years purchase of the annuity according to the actuarial table. He was well aware that under the recent concession of the Government, after the fourteen years reduction period there would be a seven years additional run allowed to those who were fortunate enough to have got into that period, and to get through it. The Government themselves recognised the impediments put in the way of the further seven years run. At what did they estimate it for compensation purposes? They only valued it at three years. If the Government only valued it at three years, it should not be called a seven years run. He should prefer to call it a further three years reduction period. A three years annuity, if purchased at once on the 4 per cent. table, was only worth one and a half years. Adding the thirteen years to the three years reduction period made sixteen years in all, and he found that the present value of a sixteen years annuity at 4 per cent. was eleven and a half years purchase of the annuity. That was all that the Government themselves professed to give under the clause. Therefore, the first position they arrived at was that instead of the trade compensating the trade on the basis of the full market value of the licence, which was the course followed by the authors of the Act of 1904, the present Bill restricted the compensation to a sum which represented merely the purchase value of an eleven and a half years annuity. That was the best that could happen to a licensee beginning with the first year of the reduction period, but the further they marched along the road the less the annuity became, until they arrived at zero. The second position, which was quite as important as the first, was that even with this narrow term of years it was not proposed to compensate according to the market value, but according to the fallacious canon of compensation adopted by the Inland Revenue after the passing of the Act of 1904. Why were the Government driving the trade into this impossible financial position in regard to the compensation to be provided by the trade itself? It was because of the reduction period and the number of licences which they insisted upon the authorities taking away during the reduction period. Inasmuch as the proposal was to take away 30,000 licences—probably the number would be a great deal more—if they were going to cut their coat according to their cloth, they would be precluded from giving proper compensation because the compensation fund would not go round. There was not enough butter to butter the bread, and, therefore, they would provide bread and scrape instead. The Government now condemned the method of arriving at compensation through market value, laid down by the Act of 1904, because many of the speakers on the new Government side, when the Act of 1904 was before the House, had the temerity to make estimates for themselves as to how compensation would probably work out. The compensation worked out at much higher figures than the figures in the speeches. But even if the estimates of compensation made by Conservative orators in 1904 were wrong the basis that underlay their whole argument was not wrong. That argument was that they must ascertain the value of the licence in the open market. They never went away from that. The whole underlying proposition of the Act of 1904 was that the estimate of the value was to be the value in the open market. And why not? The only way of ascertaining the true value of any article, whether it was a licence or any other object of property, was what would the public give for it in the open market. That was the only tangible and true test. That was the basis which the late Sir William Harcourt laid down in the Death Duties Act of 1894. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue when assessing any property for death duties took the market value. And it was here that, in his view, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue went hopelessly wrong when trying to assess the compensation due for the extinction of a licence because they went away altogether from the course which they were accustomed to pursue in estimating the death duties. They adopted the altogether fallacious method of proceeding under Schedule A of the Income-Tax, and taking the difference between the value of a house when licensed and when not licensed. That brought him to the Kennedy judgment given in the case of the Ashby Brewery Company. Mr. Justice Kennedy held, speaking broadly, that what had to be ascertained was the value in the open market of the licensed property in question. Mr. Justice Kennedy having laid that down as a basis, proceeded to pursue his own method of ascertaining the market value. There might be many different methods of arriving at the market value, and Mr. Justice Kennedy took his own. That judgment was pronounced after the present Government came into office and they took the opinion of their own Law Officers upon it. Their own Law Officers told them that the judgment was sound, and that if they appealed against it to the House of Lords they had no prospect of success. The only quotation with which he need trouble the House was one from what the Lord Chief Justice said in another case about the Kennedy judgment. It was an *obiter dictum*, he knew, but nevertheless it was extremely valuable. In the present year, on the 17th March last, the Lord Chief Justice said—

> "You do not attack Mr. Justice Kennedy's judgment. I do not think anybody can, as a matter of fact."

The Lord Chief Justice said that, not in the course of giving his judgment, but in the course of the case under hearing. But when giving his judgment on the 18th March the Lord Chief Justice said—

> "It is not part of my duty in this case, nor have I the right, to criticise or deal with the Kennedy judgment in the Ashby case. Both parties have followed it. But I do desire to say this: that, in so far as it is necessary to consider the Ashby judgment in order to consider its bearing on subsection (2) of the Act of 1904—if I may be allowed to say so with very great deference—I cannot see how it can possibly be attacked. It seems to me to have proceeded on a basis practically admitted by the Law Officers of the Crown, and it has not been appealed against."

The Prime Minister when first introducing this measure, and at later stages, talked about the fundamental vice of the Kennedy judgment, and he inferred from these statements that what the Prime Minister objected to was not the Act of 1904 but the erroneous way in which he conceived Mr. Justice Kennedy interpreted that Act. Therefore, it was with considerable surprise that he found that on the 25th October, 1906, the hon. Member for the New Forest division asked the Prime Minister this question—

> "Will His Majesty's Government direct an appeal to be made to a higher Court of justice to reverse the Kennedy judgment?"

And the Prime Minister, who now talked of the "fundamental vice" of the Kennedy judgment, said in reply to that question—

> "His Majesty's Government do not propose to give directions for an appeal, as they are advised that as the law at present stands under the terms of the Licensing Act of 1904, an appeal cannot succeed."

The Prime Minister surely spoke in two entirely different voices. On the first occasion, in 1906, in answer to one of his own supporters he said in effect, the Licensing Act of 1904 standing as it did, that Mr. Justice Kennedy's judgment was perfectly right and that it would be useless to appeal against it. But a year and a half after, when this Bill was initiated, the Prime Minister appeared to have forgotten that answer to the question of his own supporter and made a violent attack on the judgment. It appeared to him that the Act of 1904 was right, that the Kennedy judgment was right, and that the present Government in now turning that Act and that judgment topsy turvey and substituting for that method of arriving at compensation value the Schedule A method, were getting on to an extremely boggy, dangerous, and if he might say so, impossible ground. The hon. and learned Member for Kingston had pointed out that they were now going to base compensation upon what? Why, on a new assessment for income-tax under Schedule A. The old assessment was to be altered and a new one put in its place. What must necessarily follow from any new assessment for income-tax under Schedule A? At present in the London area the assessment for rating purposes was the same as the assessment for income-tax; therefore, if they were going to put the screw on the assessment for income-tax in the London area, the assessment for rating purposes would follow. They would run in harness. That was not the practice in the country, but he was told that the inevitable result in the country would be that the raising of the assessment for income-tax purposes would be sympathetically followed by the raising of the assessment for rating purposes as well. The Government, in their blind desire to disturb the existing sound basis of compensation, were going to upset the rating on licensed houses all over the country. The result would be that on licensed houses the assessment for income-tax purposes and rating purposes would be like hillocks standing up on a flat plain. It would only be the miserable licensed property that would have to be submitted to that exceptional treatment and that exceptional process. It was the first step that counted. The Government had not looked sufficiently far forward to see in what position this new assessment was going to put them. If they tried to arrive at a proper compensation for the extinguished licensed property on the basis of the present Schedule A assessment for income-tax purposes then they would arrive at a ludicrous result. He had in a former debate instanced the "Coach and Horses." The reserve price of the "Coach and Horses" was £10,000. That house was put up to auction and sold at that reserve price. If they worked out the value according to the Schedule A assessment of the "Coach and Horses" for income-tax purposes they would not get within many thousands of the price obtained, viz., £10,000. Speaking from memory he thought it worked out at no more than £2,000 or £3,000. This proved that to make the present assessment for income-tax purposes the basis of compensation was impossible, and that to raise the whole assessment of licensed property was grossly unfair. The Government were not going to make a friend of the licence-holder. All through the Bill the Government had been playing for the support of the licence-holder. He wondered if the licence-holders realised what was going to be the effect of this re-assessment of licensed property which was not going to stop at re-assessment for income-tax purposes, but was going to extend all round the orbit of local taxation. The licence-holder was not going to be very grateful to the present Government when he realised that fact. The Government were on unsound ground, and they must and did know it. They must and they did know that the only true basis of value was that adopted by the Act of 1904, namely, the value which any man would give for the property in the open market. The Kennedy judgment, having followed that canon of construction, proceeded upon firm and true lines which could not be upset. He begged to second.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 11, to leave out Clause 10.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out down to the word 'the' in page 7, line 13, stand part of the Bill."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid): In his speech in moving this Amendment the hon. and learned Member for Kingston said that in his opinion there was a legal estate and a legal title in the licence at the present moment which could not properly be abrogated by time-limit at all. With respect to that matter, the hon. Member is, I think, at variance with a good many Members on his own side of the House. He certainly differs from the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. But, as I understand the hon. and learned Gentleman, he only threw out his opinion on this matter by way of protesting against any suggestion that he acceded to the opposite view. I am not at all sure that he was raising a discussion upon it at the present moment, and therefore I will not discuss that point, which has been debated over and over again in this House, but I will address myself to the other portions of his speech. He referred to the period of three years, which by the Amendment of the

Government will be added to the time in computing the annuity upon the basis of which the compensation is to be made to a person whose licence is taken away. He asked what is the logical basis for the term of three years, but the House will know that the reduction period has not been altered at all by the extension of the seven years after the fourteen years. The period of statutory reduction was and still remains a period of fourteen years. I will not discuss with the hon. Member for York whether it comes down to thirteen or lower or whether it is fifteen or higher, but whatever the reduction period was it still remains the reduction period, and it was only out of concession to the demands made on the other side in order to prevent further financial disturbance to the trade, that the Government made a further extension of seven years—not as a further extension of the reduction period, but as a rest period during which there should be no compensation levy at all, during which no such compensation should be paid, if a licence was taken away, and during which—and this is the main purpose of the concession—no monopoly value should be exacted from the licensee in possession at the end of the fourteen years reduction period. It is very difficult to estimate exactly what the value of that extension is, and I do not propose at the present moment to discuss it in detail. It does not arise on the Motion to leave out the clause, and we shall reach it very soon and discuss it upon my Amendment, or at least I hope so. But lest it should be said that nothing was stated about it from these benches in the event of its not being reached I will make one or two observations upon it. It is almost impossible to calculate the value to those who possess licences which may be taken away during the reduction period, of the possibility of being able to continue beyond the reduction period and going on for a period of rest for seven years. Various views may be taken of this. One view is this, and I think it is sound. If fourteen years is the right period for the reduction of the licences, and if a licence is taken away in that period, whether it is in the first, second, or fourteenth year *ex hypothesi* it is properly taken away, and therefore it may very well be sound argument that that person who loses his licence at that time or during any portion of the reduction period is not entitled to anything further by way of compensation because those licences which survive the reduction period have a period of rest for seven years. I think that is sound legal argument, but the Government notwithstanding have made the concession. They would have been entitled to say: "Your licence has been properly taken away, and you have no right to take into account the fact that other licences will be allowed to continue for another seven years." But perhaps as a sort of compromise it was said: "Well, at any rate, at the beginning of the reduction period, or during the reduction period there may be the expectation on the part of the holder of a licence that his licence will not be taken away, and if it is not, he will have a further seven years rest." In respect of that, the Government have proposed to move an Amendment later on, giving an addition of three years to the period which is to be calculated for the purpose of arriving at the annuity which is to fix the compensation of the licence-holder. That is more by way of bonus than by way of right, and I do not think it lies in the mouth of anybody who gets that bonus from the Government, to complain that it is not the exact actuarial value of the chance of his licence remaining during the period of seven years. Of course, the licence may be extinguished during the seven years by local veto. That is quite true, but in any event that possibility does not prevent the person whose licence has been previously extinguished getting three years. There are other conditions which are applicable besides the local veto, because during the period of seven years the licence can be taken away by the magistrates just as it could be taken away by them before the Act of 1904, not merely because of misconduct. The hon. Gentleman asked also this question: "Why do you not pay compensation during the further period of seven years?" The answer to that is perfectly simple. We do not exact the compensation levy during the seven years, and, therefore, it would not be right to pay compensation during that period. I am not quite sure, if it be the view of the trade that they ought to receive compensation during the seven years, and if they are willing to pay a compensation levy, that there would be any great objections to that, but the fact is that no compensation levy would be made, and, therefore, no compensation is possible during the seven years. The state of things as regards the seven years would be exactly the state of things which existed before 1904. At that time the licences might be taken away under the judicial discretion of the justices, without any compensation being paid at all.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said there was then no local veto at all.

SIR S. EVANS: I am not discussing the matter in regard to local veto. I am now answering a question of the hon. and learned Gentleman as to why we do not provide for the compensation for licences taken away during the seven years period. The House will remember that many of these licences were taken away before 1904, and that the right hon. Gentleman was moved to bring in the Act of 1904 because of those cases. Some other questions were put by the hon. and learned Gentleman with regard to Schedule A value. I am not going again, at this time of day, into the question of the Kennedy judgment; it has been argued over and over, with more or less knowledge, by those who have argued for or against it. But whether the Kennedy judgment is right or not, I do not think it can be contended that it was the intention of the proposers of the Act of 1904 that their Act should be as declared by the Kennedy judgment. The Kennedy judgment stands as a matter of law, but that is no reason why the House should not change it. In hundreds of cases compensation was probably awarded both by the justices and by the Inland Revenue authorities before the Kennedy judgment upon a totally different basis. The Kennedy judgment was pronounced in 1906 and during the year 1905 all the licences which were reduced in that year were valued by the Inland Revenue upon a totally different basis.

MR. CAVE: A great many were valued on the same footing.

SIR S. EVANS: I said that they were probably valued by the justices on a different footing. Whatever the state of affairs was as decided by the Kennedy judgment, this House, by the Second Reading of this Bill, has decided that it ought not to continue to be the basis on which compensation is to be paid, and the question which arises is not whether our proposals are within the Kennedy judgment, but whether they are right. We have put down definitely the basis upon which compensation is to be given, and we have also put down the basis of the monopoly value which is to be exacted both for new licences before the reduction period of fourteen years has expired and for all licences to which monopoly value attaches afterwards. You must take, as intended by the Act of 1904, the difference in value of the premises as licensed premises, and of the premises without a licence. That excludes altogether the brewer's profits. Let me give an illustration of how the Kennedy judgment would work out. A brewer might own one "tied" house, from which he derived considerable profit, but it was so situated as to be worth a considerable amount for other purposes; and he might have another house from which he obtained a small profit, but so situated that it would be of little use for other purposes, and yet in the latter case, he would obtain under the Kennedy judgment, more compensation than he would on the former.

MR. CAVE: So he would under this Bill.

SIR S. EVANS: No, I think not. Let me take a case from Chester, that of the "Freemason's Arms," which was argued before Mr. Justice Bray. It was an ante-1869 beer-house, and the brewer supplied 100 barrels of beer a year. During three years the number of barrels of beer supplied was sixty, but nevertheless upon that a considerable profit was made by the brewer *qua* brewer. The profit was said to be about 14s. 6d. or 15s. a barrel, and Mr. Justice Bray said 14s. 6d. was nearer the mark but he would take 15s. to make it less complicated, and in that case it was held that the brewer was entitled to £1,250, The Schedule A valuation is intended to mark the difference between the value of the premises with and without the licence, and that is not the case in any valuation that now exists. That ought to be found before you can comply with the law, and, therefore, I submit to the House that the proposals of the Government are perfectly right and equitable. First of all you take the value of the premises with the licence and without the licence, and the difference between the two represents the monopoly value of the licence. The proceedings before the Inland Revenue Commissioners, as to which the hon. and learned Member asked me, are precisely the same under this Bill as under the Act of 1904, save that under the Act of 1904 there is an appeal. The proceedings would also be exactly the same for estate duty purposes. There is no difference in the proceedings which lead up to the valuation under this Bill and those under the Act of 1904. Under the Act of 1904 there is an appeal, but that, so far as mere ascertainment of value is concerned, has been very rarely, if at all, made. Where there have been appeals they have been made, not on a question of fact, but on a question of principle. Is it necessary or advisable that there should be an appeal on the mere question of valuation? The proceedings before the Inland Revenue Commissioners are very like those in regard to arbitration, where when the two parties concerned fix on an arbitrator there is no appeal on a question of fact.

MR. CAVE: The arbitrator is bound to hear evidence.

SIR S. EVANS: I have dealt with that point and I have said that in that matter it is exactly the same as under the Act of 1904. What is the position? The Inland Revenue Commissioners have no duty to perform except to do what they think is right as between the parties. They have the evidence and material before them, and when they have found the difference between the value of the house with the licence and without the licence that is the value of the monopoly.

MR. YOUNGER: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in Scotland there is an appeal to the Court of Session from the assessment imposed by the Inland Revenue authorities, and it is thought desirable that there should be?

SIR S. EVANS: There is an appeal under Schedule A here, but I am not addressing my argument to that subject. I am addressing it to the figures to be ascertained. The hon. and learned Member said that the actual licence-holder will be better off under the Bill than under the Act of 1904. So he will be and so he ought to be. His exact position under the Act of 1904 depends entirely on the agreement he has with the brewer as to what compensation he receives, but we propose to give him not merely what is due to him as a tenant from year to year, but compensation for loss of profit, and we also provide compensation to the manager, who got nothing under the Act of 1904, if he is not the tenant.

*MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) desired to say a few words as to the question of assessment which had been imported into the discussion, and with regard to the question of what amount of goodwill should be considered for compensation. The hon. Member for Appleby had spoken with some disgust of the amount of compensation which had, under the Act of 1904 and the Kennedy judgment, been awarded to licensed houses whose licences had been extinguished. He spoke of the compensation as being equivalent to forty-one times the value of the annual assessment of those establishments. That might be so, but it was also the amount upon which estate duty had been paid to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. Compensation had hitherto been given not only for local goodwill, but also for personal goodwill. Compensation was given for both because both were taken away. Under this Bill it was not only that the local goodwill was taken away by the closing of the house, but also the personal goodwill, because it was not intended that the tenant of that house should pursue his calling anywhere else. It was, therefore, only right that the man should be paid compensation for both local and personal goodwill. On the question of assessment, the Prime Minister had spoken, he thought, exceedingly unfairly, for he had imported a certain amount of animus into the discussion by speaking as if the under-assessment of brewery property for income-tax under Schedule A was an evasion not only of local but of national obligations; but the right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that so far as they diminished the amount paid under Schedule A, they increased the contribution under Schedule D. When they came to the question of assessment to local rates it had been suggested over and over again on those benches that inasmuch as the annual value of premises was augmented by reason of the fact that the business of a publican was carried on there, therefore the assessment should be raised above the value of similar premises not so profitably used for the purposes of local taxation. He dissented from that view. The obligation of a certain quantity of bricks and mortar to contribute to local taxes was measured by the demands which those bricks and mortar made upon the public services paid for out of the local rates. The amount of money made in business by the man who lived inside the walls formed by the bricks and mortar had nothing whatever to do with the rates. They would find, if they took other businesses, that if it was a question of compensation both of local and personal goodwill, forty-one times the assessment was by no means an extravagant amount to award. He took the figures of the hon. Member for Appleby, who said that forty-one times the assessment was wholly in excess of what ought to be awarded. He would apply this measure to his own case. He was not a brewer; he was a solicitor. He occupied premises which were assessed at something like £230 a year. He lived inside those premises in the exercise of his profession. He was not now giving accurate figures, but suppose that he made £1,000 a year, and that the authorities not only closed his premises, but said that he would not be allowed to carry on business anywhere else—which was what the publican would be told according to the Bill—if they give him forty-one times the assessment of the premises, the award would be rather above eight years purchase. That was not an excessive amount to give to anyone deprived of a business on which he relied for the livelihood of himself and dependents. He should certainly support the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kingston.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) said he was rather gratified to hear the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite in regard to assessment as the basis of compensation. They had heard a great deal about under-assessment of public-houses being one of the reasons for treating them differently from the way in which they would treat any ordinary property. In reference to assessments, at any rate in the north, it was generally known that the basis of assessment was 10 per cent. of the takings of the public-house; that was to say, the takings of the public-house were carefully examined, and the assessment for local taxation was based on 10 per cent. of those takings. The five years takings included beer, spirits, soda water, cigars, and all the other various articles sold in the house. Therefore, when they heard statements as to the under-assessment of public-houses, he thought there should be some recognition of the fact that the assessments, at all events in the north, were taken on that basis. He founded his statement on a decision of the Lancashire Quarter Sessions. It so happened that he had not the case with him, but it was reported in the *Manchester Guardian*. In that case Quarter Sessions decided that the basis of assessment of public-houses was five years takings. As to the clause they were now discussing, he regarded it as the most serious one in the Bill for the brewer. He could not understand how the Government could uphold it as a just principle upon which to base compensation in respect of those houses which lost their licences during the fourteen years. How did the Solicitor-General differentiate between the houses which lasted out the fourteen years and those whose licences were extinguished? On the Second Reading and early in these discussions the statement—prompted he thought by the dictator of the Government, the right hon. Member for Spen Valley—was repeated over and over again, that it was a most generous proposal to give the tenants fourteen years profits, which were equal to ten years purchase of the goodwill. That had reference to houses which remained during the whole fourteen years, and in respect of these the Bill gave full profits not only according to the Kennedy judgment, but over and above the Kennedy judgment. It gave them full profits, not only on the sale of beer and spirits, but on the sale of soda water, tobacco and other articles. It also gave to the manager, the servants, the carpenters, the cleaners, the plumbers and everybody connected with the house full employment during those fourteen years, which, as had been stated, was equivalent to ten years purchase of the profits during that period. If that was right, and it was stated to be correct in regard to the period of fourteen years, then how were they to look at the position of those houses the licences of which were extinguished in the course of the fourteen years? Were they to receive the same terms as those which lasted the fourteen years? The answer was: "Decidedly not." Those which lasted the fourteen years were to have the full profits of every sort and kind, but to those whose licences were extinguished within that period nothing whatever was to be given except the wretched difference under Schedule A, which, as had been amply proved by figures given to the House, was a very small sum indeed, and nothing in comparison with the ten years purchase of goodwill. They had, the other day, in answer to a Question, some figures given as regarded the compensation paid since 1st August, 1906. It was stated that in the case of 742 houses the compensation paid amounted to £671,795. In a further Answer given to the Question, it was added that under Schedule A the difference between the value of the houses with the licence and the value without the licence was £14,561, which was the basis on which compensation was now to be calculated. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had admitted that ten years purchase was a fair price to pay. But next year, if this Bill became law, all these houses would be taken as if compensation was to be paid on the basis under this Bill; that was to say, instead of receiving, as they had received since August, 1906, the sum of £671,000, the holders of those houses would only receive £145,000. The right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary shook his head. But it was quite clear that under Schedule A, according to the Answer given by the Secretary to the Treasury, they would only receive £145,000, or about one-fifth of the £671,000 which they had actually received since August, 1906. In addition to that enormous loss which those houses would have sustained had the provisions of this Bill been applied to them, there was the fact that the houses which remained during the whole of the fourteen years would receive full profits, including the whole of the brewer's profits, based upon Schedule A, but those houses which lost their licence in the fourteen years would receive compensation based on the difference between Schedule A when the house was occupied with a licence and Schedule A when it was occupied without a licence. Of course, there was this addition, that the licence-holder was to receive a certain amount for loss of business, but it was a very small addition. That compensation was qualified by one very curious provision in subsection (*a*) of Clause 11, which stated that the amount awarded as compensation, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, might be retained by the licence-holder. That appeared to be a very illegal clause, because the licence-holder as a rule was a debtor to the brewer, who he supposed could not enforce his debt. It was a new principle. It was certainly in accordance with the principle of this Bill. It was a curious thing that the brewer was the only person who was said to be doing an improper thing when he had a tied house, and in consequence of his having tied houses he was treated as a pariah and outside the pale of ordinary regulations. The tied house was one of the incidents of the trade of to-day. The Home and Colonial Stores, dairy companies, and millers, all had their tied houses, and were all paid in exactly the same way as the brewer, and there was no bigger instance of a tied house than the banker. But if a banker had his tied house and had his business interfered with for any purpose of legislation, on what basis was the compensation paid? The brewer, the publican, the miller, the grocer, and the co-operative stores were not content, when compensation had to be paid them for removal or disturbance of their premises, to be paid on the basis of what the books showed as the profits of the respective houses which were tied to them. They had to be paid on the profits which they could show not only on the house that was tied, but on the basis of the amount at which the goods were charged, because in all these cases, so far as his experience went, the goods were always charged at a pretty full rate to tied houses, and compensation was charged on the profits made by the wholesale house in reference to its sales to the tied house. But here they were putting the brewer in a different category from other tied houses. The man, under Clause 10, who lost his licence during the fourteen years received nothing in comparison with the others with whom the Bill dealt. If they were going to deal with the two classes let them deal with them on the same basis. The difference between the value of the premises licensed and unlicensed was very frequently little or nothing—£5 or £10—and on that basis they were going to buy the man out and cancel the enormous obligations which he had incurred. One reason given for taking this basis of compensation was that the money would not go round if they had it on any proper legal principle, and therefore the Under-Secretary had to tell them that he had to damage the property. He was like the boy who had a penny and wanted to buy a twopenny tart. He stuck his finger through it and asked: "How much for your damaged tart?" That was the principle on which the Bill proceeded. They had not the money to go round and pay the proper compensation due to those who were to be extinguished under Clause 10, and so they paid on a basis which was absolutely illegal in principle and had no honesty about it. They considered that by this means they could reduce licences in consonance with the wishes of their supporters. When they came further to this three years term they found it was entirely rule of thumb. The right hon. Gentleman gave seven years, but he would not admit that he had given it rightly. It seemed to be a sort of gift that he was taking back into his pocket. He had no basis on which he fixed these three years, but he split the difference. Three years was very nearly a half of seven years, so they fixed three years. In no particular was the clause founded on principles of justice and he hoped it would be thrown out.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) was sorry he could not agree with the hon. Member, though by an entirely different mode of reasoning he had arrived at somewhat similar practical results. Hon. Gentlemen opposite regarded compensation as a matter of right. He had always looked at it from the point of view of the outsider who had not a licence but wished he had, who had no position of advantage and no monopoly. Why should these people who had had a monopoly for so long grumble when at last it was taken from them, and they were reduced to the same level as the outsiders who never had a monopoly? If it were a question of paying compensation to the owners of suppressed licences out of taxation, he should furiously oppose, but under the 1904 Act they were compensated by themselves, and not by the public. When it was a question of compensation out of the trade why on earth should not they have as much compensation as ever they liked to pay for? If there was not enough to go round let them raise the levy. They took the point of view of their legal right. Of course, the legal right was qualified. He had always taken the view that *de facto* they had no right. Why were they bringing in this Bill? It was because the licence-holders had conducted war against society, and society therefore had a right to war against the trade. They might have had a right if they had conducted their business as if they held a solemn trust to be used in a way that would benefit the community. But they had held it in a way which benefited themselves and not the community.

They had broken their trust and must not plead that they were entitled to this compensation as an inalienable right. If they came into Court they must come with clean hands. The question amounted to this. The whole business of the world was conducted by practical business men in a spirit of compromise. In every question of a bargain one man held one view and the other man another. It was no good one man trying to enforce his view. He must come to an agreement with the other man. It seemed to him that the people with licences had it strongly in their minds that this clause would do them a good deal of harm, and would take away their trade without compensation. Supposing a man had invested £1,000 in a licensed house and that licence was taken away from him under this Bill and he suffered a loss of £300. Nothing would make that man satisfied, and both he and his friends would go away saying that he had been robbed. Of course he would not have been robbed, but he would say that he had been robbed, and he hoped the Government would, in order to avoid such injustice, decide to give the market value. He did not care what market value was, but they ought to have it in the Bill, and then that would be a complete answer to anybody who said they were going to be robbed by this measure. The compensation was going to come out of the trade, and why should they quarrel about it? He had listened to the Solicitor-General with an intense desire to follow his arguments, and he had tried to understand why the seven years was not to be added when it was a question of calculating the compensation due under Schedule A. He was not satisfied that the difference in the Schedule A valuation was the correct measure of compensation due. When a man had taken a house with a licence and arranged to pay the rent, then he was in a position to start business, and he would probably go on, and in the course of time make a profit. Under this clause if they took away that man's licence they would not only take away the difference between the two valuations under Schedule A, but they would also take away that man's living.

Mr. Lupton.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: And he would receive special compensation for that.

*MR. LUPTON said he would be only too delighted to listen to any explanation which the right hon. Gentleman could give to the House in order to show where such provision was made. The man who had bought the house was going to lose something and it might be a case where he did not manage the licensed premises himself. He did not think the difference between the two Schedule A valuations represented the legitimate loss. He failed to see that the compensation proposed was sufficient, because they ought to take into consideration the business which a man brought to the premises which he had rented. He hoped the Government would see their way to substitute seven years for three years, and he thought in listening to the Solicitor-General that he was preparing the way for that alteration, because he said they were giving this bonus of three years although he had no principle to give it upon. If they would only give seven years they would have a clear principle to work upon. This was a very trifling matter as regarded the cost and it would not cost the Government anything. It would be an immense advantage to hon. Members to be able to prove to the country that this was not a confiscatory Bill. He was certain that it was not himself, but the difficulty was to persuade the country.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said this clause appeared to him to be quite the most serious in the whole Bill, and the illustration which the hon. Member had just given happily described the situation in which a great many people would be placed. The hon. Member had mentioned the case in which a man would lose £300, and would then declare that he had been robbed. There would be no doubt that that man had that money a little time ago, but he would not have it when this clause was put into operation. The hon. Member for York, in a closely reasoned speech, had dealt with the reduction period and he thought that that speech was entitled to a more detailed reply than it had received from the representatives of the Government. The hon. Member for York had pointed out that the thirteen years had now been whittled down, and the seven years promised had been put into the form of three years, for no particular reason. The Solicitor-General called it a bonus, but that was the first time he had heard that word applied to this measure. The hon. Member for Lincoln last night said that there would be local option, as well as the justices' discretion over the last seven years during which the compensation levy would not be charged, and the money which they thought was a bonus would really have to go in paying the insurance to meet those two risks. The Solicitor-General whittled down his seven years to three years, and then the hon. Member for Lincoln said that that money would be needed to ensure them against the possibility of local option and magisterial discretion. The real point was that people were in possession of something which was going to be taken away from them, and they had to consider what they were going to receive in lieu thereof. He would like the Government to tell the House deliberately whether they intended to give the market value or not? He would like to know whether the Solicitor-General contended that Schedule A valuation represented market value. It would be illuminating to the House if the Government would state and argue that proposition. This particular scheme would hit the licensed trade in other directions beyond the mere question of compensation. He did not want to state the case too high, but they all knew very well that if suppressed licences were to be bought out on this basis, obviously it would be in the owners' interest, if in no one else's interest, to have placed upon the Schedule A assessment as high a valuation as possible. Of course, owners of the houses that did not expect to be suppressed and did not desire to speculate upon that probability would not place themselves upon such a high assessment under Schedule A. They had not been told whether in the scheme of reduction which the justices had to prepare the magistrates would have access to the valuation books. Would the justices have to contemplate the scheme of reduction simply judicially, or would they have regard to the valuation placed upon the premises, whether high or low, by other people? Whichever way they acted complications and inconvenience would naturally arise unless a public department stepped in to hold a fair balance as to the basis of valuation amongst the parties concerned. The scheme would hit the licensed trade very hardly in another way. It was obvious that the local rates ought to be carefully considered. He ventured the other night across the floor of the House to ask the Prime Minister whether this matter of the valuation would not affect the local rates, and he replied that in his opinion it would not. Since then he had taken an opportunity of looking into the matter, and he found that Assessment Committees had the power of access to the Schedule A valuation, and it was obvious enough when they found themselves assessed on that valuation upon the higher basis they would naturally take advantage of that intelligence and raise the local assessment. But that was not all. They were going a step further. The licence duty had to be paid, and that would be calculated upon the standard of value. Therefore the licence duty would also rise. Then there was the compensation levy which was collected and assessed in the same way. The result would be that a higher local assessment—he was not saying that it ought not to be higher—a higher assessment of the licence duty, and a higher compensation levy during the fourteen years would all fall upon the publican. He had found it very difficult to get the information which was necessary to discuss this question of Schedule A valuation. It had been stated that the time-limit was taken in a haphazard fashion and that there was no statistical data upon which it was based. He had the answer to the question on this point which he put to the Prime Minister. He had tried to find out himself what would be the effect of this Schedule A valuation, and in answer to repeated questions the Department had stated that they had not got the necessary information which would enable them to answer his question. He admitted that he did get one set of answers in the case of two public houses which were suppressed in the county in which he lived, and where he was himself a member of the compensation authority. The houses were in Hertfordshire and were suppressed under the 1904 Act. He would quote the figures showing the decision of the Inland Revenue Commissioners in regard to these houses, the figures under the Kennedy judgment, and the figures under Schedule A. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer in March last—

> "If he will state the compensation which the 'Sawyer's Arms' at Hertford and the 'Queen' at Codicote would receive, respectively, under the 1904 Act if fixed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, if fixed on the basis of Lord Justice Kennedy's judgment, and what they would receive, respectively, in each of the fourteen years under the proposal of the present Licensing Bill."

And the reply he received was as follows—

> "Although the trade done did not amount to a barrel of beer a week in either case, the compensation actually rewarded on the basis of Lord Justice Kennedy's judgment was £451 for the 'Sawyer's Arms,' and £362 for the 'Queen.' The first awards by the Inland Revenue Department on the basis adopted before the Kennedy judgment were £105 and £175, respectively. If these beer-houses were closed under the Licensing Bill provisions, compensation would be based on new valuations of the premises, licensed and unlicensed, and these valuations I am unable to give."

He thought he had better go to another Government Department and at a subsequent date he got this information —

> "Prior to the abolition of the licence, the Schedule A assessment was £18 in the case of the 'Sawyer's Arms,' and £12 in the case of the 'Queen.' The effect of abolishing the licence was to leave the assessment unaffected in the case of the 'Sawyer's Arms,' and to increase it from £12 to £19 in the case of the 'Queen.'"

It was obvious that under Schedule A these houses would have received nothing at all, except, on the off-chance, a few pounds for the fixtures, whereas under the Kennedy judgment they received the amounts stated. The Solicitor-General had argued about some houses in the north of England; he said that if a brewer happened to own two houses near one another, it would be altogether monstrous, if one house was closed, that he should receive compensation for the loss which apparently on paper he had sustained, because the probability was that the trade would have filtered to the brewer's other house. That might be a perfectly good argument under the Act of 1904, but it could not be used under the present Bill. Under the 1904 Act, he admitted, the brewer would get the trade, but nothing of the sort could occur under the circumstances which would be created by this Bill. They were told the other evening by the right hon. Gentleman representing the Home Office that about 1600 licensed houses had been suppressed in recent years. That number included those extinguished under the Act of 1904, plus those which from other causes had been got rid of. He understood that under the present Bill it was intended to get rid of 2,500 per year. If the Government kept to the principle of getting rid of 2,500 houses, and also of levying, not according to the schedule, but in an unlimited way, why should it matter to them in any shape or form if the parties themselves preferred to pay on a principle which they understood and desired? He could not see why the Government should be contentious in regard to that. This was in no sense whatever an attack on the principle of the Bill. The Government said that they did not know exactly what the levy would be, but that did not matter. If the levy was unlimited and if they knew that they were required to get rid of a certain number of houses, why did they not show that they absolutely believed in this method of making the levy by leaving the parties themselves to compensate themselves? He put that point seriously to the Government. If they accepted the suggestion, he believed it would go a long way towards assisting many people who were very much inconvenienced as the present moment. He did not agree with the hon. and learned Member for Kingston that concessions had not been given to the tenants. On the contrary, he considered that great concessions had been given to the tenants since the Bill was brought in, but he did not think that the concessions had gone quite far enough. The Government and their supporters said that they disliked the tied house system, and anything which was likely to lead to a system of tied clubs. He had given notice of an Amendment dealing with a class of people who were not in tied houses, namely, those who brewed their own beer. He did not believe that 1 per cent. of licence holders brewed their own beer, and sold it in premises adjacent to the place where it was brewed, but they were a class whose interests ought to be protected. He asked the Government whether they intended to do anything in respect of that little class. Their position was unique. If their houses were shut up under the scheme of the Bill, they would not be able so carry on business in any form. They were not like the big brewers, inasmuch as they could not turn to somewhere else to sell their beer. If the Government did not believe in the system of tied houses, here was a good opportunity of encouraging free tenants who existed at the present time. He did not know that any lawyer or statesman would be able to devise a measure which would effectively do away with the tied house system. In the present form he opposed the clause, and he would be extremely grateful to the Government if they could see their way to alter the basis of compensation so that the people who paid would be left to decide how they were to collect and distribute the compensation fund.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he wished to revert to the question of what was meant by the phrase "market value." He had no objection whatever to the market value being paid for licences, but the difficulty arose when they proceeded to find out what the market value was. He had no objection to the Kennedy judgment in so far as the learned Judge decided that the market value was to be paid. He joined issue with the learned Judge in the method he adopted of finding the market value. The learned Judge said that the probable purchaser would be a brewer. That might be so, but a brewer would not buy if the public-house was not making money *qua* public-house. If they imagined that a brewer would give ten years purchase of the profits he might make by supplying a public-house, that seemed to him, as a business man, a great absurdity. Take the profits at £100 a year, was there any business man in the City of London who would give £1,000 for the purpose of earning £100 a year? He had never heard of such a man. A man no doubt would invest £1,000 at 5 per cent., but then he would not have to make the £50 interest himself. The Kennedy judgment in this respect failed to find the market value. In a previous debate he mentioned a case which came under his notice where £1,000 was paid for a business which was losing money every day. In another case a firm of brewers leased a public-house in Poplar. They offered to pay the landlord £200 to cancel the lease. The landlord declined. The house was put up for sale, and not a single bid was obtained. Last year under the Kennedy judgment the compensation paid for that house was £1,700. He was not a teetotaller, but he professed to be a business man. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were alarming themselves a very great deal about this matter, but he firmly believed, from the inquiries he had made and from figures he had seen, that ninety out of every 100 of the suppressed houses during the last two years had been failures, and as public-houses insolvent. He believed that the great bulk of the Kennedy judgment money paid by the brewers themselves to the trade had been paid for practically nothing. He had seen and communicated with clerks to licensing justices and asked why this and that house had been suppressed, and the reply was that it had been done because they were redundant. If they were redundant, they were not paying. [AN HON MEMBER: No.] He quite agreed with the hon. Member that that did not necessarily follow. But if they asked any licensing justice why he had selected this or that house to be suppressed the answer in 99 cases out of 100 would be that he had not selected it; that there had been ever so many volunteers asking to be suppressed—not ostensibly asking, but practically offering. The valuers of public-houses and the brewers were laughing at the whole thing, because they knew that they could not sell the houses. To return to the Kennedy judgment, they were supposed to find out the market value of the house to be suppressed. He had given two cases, each of which was offered for sale in the open market. The owner went to brewer after brewer and offered the house for sale. Not only that, publicans came and inspected the figures and in both cases they would not touch either. Then both were put up for auction—and was there any known way of more effectively testing the market value—and there was no bid.

Mr. YOUNGER: In what year was that?

***Mr. J. M. HENDERSON**: In the year 1906, before this Bill was ever mentioned or thought of. The Kennedy judgment was given in 1906, and then these compensations were given. But why did he believe that the bulk of the houses to be suppressed would not be able to show under Schedule D a sensible profit? It was because the brewers had helped to kill the public-houses. What did the brewers do twelve years ago? Some of them got tied houses, but some not. Those who did not get tied houses, and some of those who did, were not content with doing a wholesale trade, but entered into the retail trade. He could remember the time when the lowest quantity of beer that a man could get from a good brewery was a nine gallon cask. Then it dropped to a 4½ gallon cask; but now it was a gallon jar. He knew of a firm of potters in the neighbourhood of London who sold 500,000 of these gallon jars to brewery firms. One bought 40,000, another 40,000, another 30,000, another 20,000, and so on. These gallon jars, which were equal to six bottles, were sent out by the brewers all over the place, and delivered at houses of customers of their own tied houses. How could the poor publicans live against that competition? Not only that; three years ago the six bottles dropped down to four bottles, and any hon. Member could now write to a first class brewer and get a case of four bottles of beer delivered at his house for 1s. 6d. The Leader of the Opposition asked why they were attacking all on-licences and not off-licences. But if they attacked off-licences the greatest sufferers would be those brewers who did large retail businesses. It had been said that the best way to ascertain the market value was by arbitration. Well, he protested against the idea of arbitration ever being treated as arriving at true market value. They all knew what happened at arbitrations; they had all been there. How was the market value ascertained by an arbitrator? They had first counsel on the one side and counsel on the other. The counsel for the claimant brought forward a valuer of the highest eminence in his profession who said that the subject of arbitration was worth £1,000; and then the counsel on the other side brought forward an equally eminent valuer who said it was not worth £100, and after the counsel and the solicitors had had their fees—they had always to be satisfied first—in a couple of days they met together and found that £500 was the market value. Now, who would say that such an amount so found was the market value? How were they going to ascertain what was the market value of a house that was about to be suppressed? They could not put the house up to auction because they could not offer it, by the necessities of the case, in the open market, just because it was to be suppressed. Some simple form of reaching the value of the house had to be found, and that was by means of the Schedule A for income-tax. Why was Schedule A objected to in dealing with public-houses? It was because all sorts of different methods had been adopted by the brewers in dealing with public-houses. A brewer who acquired a public-house might deal with it in four different ways. He might put a manager in, and then he got both the wholesale and the retail profit. But that was a system not very much used in the south, because it was found that the manager did himself too well and ate and drank up the larger part of the retail profits. Another way was to put a tenant into the business with a mortgage and the tenant paid interest on the mortgage. Still another way was to charge the tenant a premium, and lend him the money which he paid off by instalments. In all these three methods the rent was fixed as low as they possibly could. Why? Simply because Schedule A did fix the compensation fund contribution and did fix the rates, and, therefore, the rent was kept as low as possible; and the difference was made up by not allowing the full discount on the beer which was supplied to the tied tenant.

MR. BARNARD: Who controls Schedule A?

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON said that Schedule A was controlled by the local assessors in conjunction with the owners of the public-houses. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Well, he had asked Inland Revenue Surveyors who told him that it was done through the local assessor and the brewer's accountant—and what a brewer's accountant did not know of Schedule A was not worth knowing—and they worked up Schedule A. But there was a fourth way—a straightforward way. The brewer charged to the publican a rent which included everything, and there was no difficulty then about Schedule A, and the publican would be compensated on a true basis. He had never listened to anything more absurd than the talk about the "Coach and Horses." He would take that as an instance of what would happen under Schedule A. Here was a business for which a man gave £10,000—[AN HON. MEMBER: "And worth how much"?]—The purchasers would have no difficulty in getting £11,000 for it—and he paid a rent of £120. But nobody knew what was the retail profit on the business of the "Coach and Horses," or what was the wholesale profit.

MR. YOUNGER: That was under Schedule D; you ought to know that.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON said that what he wanted to get at was what did the purchaser give the £10,000 for? When he was told that, then he would say whether he had been fairly treated or not. They knew that the business was manifestly making a large profit and the rent of £120 for the "Coach and Horses" was ridiculous. That was a manifest injustice. The Government had been consistent. They gave the compensation on Schedule A and they gave the monopoly value on Schedule A. The basis of payment was the same in both cases. The houses which were to be struck out during the fourteen years reduction period would be the smaller houses, and the remainder would do a better trade, and no harm would be done. Did anybody imagine that the justices would pick out the big, prosperous houses to be suppressed? Not at all; they would select the rotten houses. He was not a teetotaler or a prohibitionist—he only wanted to see done what was fair and just. What he maintained was that at the end of fourteen years they would get rid of any number of houses which were not paying, and were only preventing the others from paying. If compensation could be paid on a fair and just basis—not an extravagant basis—at the end of the fourteen years period the trade would be in a very much sounder position than it was to-day.

*MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said he had listened to the experiences of the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire with some surprise, but it seemed to him that the whole question before the House was as to the efficacy of the Schedule A as a means of arriving at the real value of a licence which had been taken away. He was not going now to argue about the Kennedy judgment, although he might have a few words to say about it later on. But he had in his hands a schedule of the licences which had been taxed for probate duty between the years 1901 and 1908. These licences were all in the London district, where Schedule A was practically the same for income-tax and rating purposes. He had there the value of certain freehold premises unlicensed, and the value of them licensed. There were twelve of them taxed for probate on a valuation of £255,000.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: What is the date?

*MR. GRETTON said that all the twelve licences dated from 1901 to 1908. These figures had been verified. The estimated assessment under Schedule A of these licences had also been given to him. They were all in the London district. The difference in the value worked out in the period of the time-limit which was given in the Bill, to the amount of only £51,400, or with the full three years added £66,800, or on the annuity basis of the Bill, £59,700—

in round figures, a difference of nearly £200,000. He gave that as an illustration of the revolutionary changes which were proposed by the method of valuation under Schedule A for the purposes of compensation.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The figures of the hon. Gentleman, like the other figures in many cases quoted on that side of the House, make no allowance whatever for the additional sum given to the tenant for his compensation, which would be in the total a very large sum.

*MR. GRETTON asked if the right hon. Gentleman maintained that the tenant's compensation would amount to between three and four times the amount paid under Schedule A, because he must base his contention on some such line as that or he would not upset the figures which had been given. The State had actually taxed these twelve licences on that amount and now the Government came down to the House of Commons and desired the State to stultify itself and offer as compensation for the value of these licences a sum of less than one-third—little more than one-quarter—of the value which the State had already taken to be the value of the licences. It would be found that the valuation under Schedule A was really of no account—or practically of no account—as regarded the taxation which the State derived out of the licensed premises. Brewery companies and others had been accused of robbing the State because Schedule A was too low. Take the case of premises with a fair rental of £40, and earning a profit of £120. In one case those premises were only assessed at £20, and it would be found that the amount which they paid under Schedule A was £1, and under Schedule D £7—a total of £8. If the same premises were assessed at £60, and also earned £120, they would pay under Schedule A £3, and under Schedule D £5. There would be a total of £8 in each case, and it did not matter whether the licensed premises were over-assessed or under-assessed in Schedule A because their assessment for taxation was completed and adjusted under Schedule D. Therefore, the whole of that argument, which had been introduced for the purpose of creating prejudice, could be dismissed. As he understood the Kennedy judgment the profits were taken per barrel. These were the retail profits although it might happen, and did often happen, that a portion of those profits by the discounts, mortgages, or other arrangements, might go into the coffers of the wholesale house. That was so, but the basis of valuation was retail profits, and he thought he could show that the basis was very low. The cheapest kind of ale sold in London was 33s. per thirty-six gallons, with a 5 per cent. discount. Two gallons were wasted, for which the retailer got an allowance, but he sold thirty-four gallons at 1s. 4d., which brought him in £2 5s. 4d,. leaving him a profit of 14s. 1d. Of course as the value of ale increased the profit increased. Take the 60s. ale at 20 per cent. discount which cost the retailer 48s. for thirty-four gallons. For those thirty-four gallons he obtained £4 8s. Therefore, the gross profit to the retailer on that transaction was £2. Of course the proportion of cheap ale and dear ale varied at different houses, but there were many houses in the London district which sold a large proportion of the 60s. ale. He, therefore thought he had shown very clearly that the 13s. or 14s. profit given in the Kennedy judgment was a very low average to be taken as the basis of gross profit per barrel when the cheapest ale made a profit of 14s. 1d. This basis of Schedule A had a very remarkable history. It had been publicly considered on many occasions, and upon every occasion every competent authority actually and practically condemned it as a method of ascertaining the value of the licences. This question was discussed before the Licensing Commission, and the Majority Report was to the effect that a little consideration of the way in which licensed premises were assessed would show that it was wholly inadmissible. This part of the Report was signed by seventeen Members of the twenty-four who sat on the Commission, including the independent panel consisting of those gentlemen who did not go on the Commission with any declared opinions before they heard any arguments. All the independent party signed that portion of the Report with the exception of Lord Peel. It was signed by Sir Algernon West, who was one of the independent members, and a past member of the Board of Inland Revenue, and by two gentlemen of pronounced temperance views, the late Dean Dickinson, and the late Mr. Allan, who was Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne. The only gentlemen who would not sign this part of the Report were Lord Peel, Archbishop Temple, and Sir William Houldsworth, who were members of the Church of England Temperance Society, and Sir Charles Cameron, well known for his strenuous support of extreme temperance views in Scotland. It was also signed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley, and the late Mr. Caine. Seventeen out of twenty-four members of that Commission, after full consideration, condemned the financial proposals which were now embodied in the Government Bill. The Inland Revenue endeavoured to establish the Schedule A as the basis of compensation under the Act of 1904. They issued a Memorandum that was the subject of appeal to the Law Courts, and was the cause of the Kennedy judgment. In the course of that hearing he believed the counsel who argued the case on behalf of the Treasury practically admitted that their case could not be carried any further, and the Solicitor to the Treasury in a very remarkable interruption said that he repudiated all responsibility for that Memorandum, as he had never been consulted. The learned Judge pronounced against the Memorandum and the Court of Appeal approved of the judgment. Every competent and independent authority which had considered this scheme of basing monopoly value and compensation upon Schedule A had practically condemned the proposal which the Government had put in their Bill. The hon. Member for Kidderminster had impressed upon the Government that the amount of the levy should be increased in order that the compensation given under this clause should also be increased. He wondered why the Government would not increase the amount of levy and so satisfy those who were to be compensated during the reduction period. The reason was extremely obvious. The Government were obliged to write down, at the lowest possible figure, the licence value for which they were going to pay compensation during the reduction period, because if they were to accede to the principle which the hon. Member for Kidderminster had urged upon them they would immediately acknowledge and embody in their own Bill a high value of licences and would stand convicted of a scheme of confiscation and spoliation when they assumed public control at the end of the reduction period. That was the reason the Government could not take the market value. Directly they took market value and put it into this clause they would at once stand convicted before the country of having proposed a scheme of spoliation and robbery.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said that nobody hereafter would be able to say that this question had not been fully discussed. It was a main topic of the debate on the Second Reading, two days had been given to it in the Committee stage, and there had been some hours discussion that day upon Report. Anybody who had listened to the debate would admit that very little new argument had been brought forward, and he could not flatter himself that he had anything very novel to say to the House. But the hon. Member for one of the divisions of Hertfordshire had referred to some statements he (Mr. Leif Jones) had made in Committee, and he had risen to say a few words in reply. His hon. friend had laid down a new theory of rating, if he had understood him aright. It was that the assessment for local rates should be in proportion to the demand made upon the rates by the bricks and mortar——

*MR. BERTRAM: I said that in my judgment, so far as I could ascertain, the basis of assessment for rating purposes should be founded on the demand which the particular block of bricks and mortar made on local services and improvements for which the rate was required.

*MR. LEIF JONES: That was to say that the assessment should be in proportion to the demand made by the particular block of buildings on the local resources, police and so forth. He did not quarrel with that, because his argument had always been that licensed premises did make a demand on the local resources, police and so on, out of all proportion to the rates they paid, as owing to the wrong method of assessment they paid a very small contribution to the expenditure they caused. His desire was that the licensed premises in this country should be taxed in proportion to the burden they laid on the local rates. Another reason why the temperance reformers welcomed this provision in the Bill was that the present system was very unequal throughout the country. In London the basis of assessment was very much that of Schedule A, but that was not so throughout the country. One great advantage of this Bill would be that as the result of Schedule A becoming the basis of assessment for compensation that assessment would be resorted to for all purposes, compensation, taxation, and rating. The hon. and learned Member for Kingston had said that to raise the assessment in regard to the liquor trade alone was unfair. Why, asked the hon. Gentleman, was this particular trade picked out? They were not responsible for their assessment. Why was this trade alone picked out for having its assessment raised? He should have thought the answer was plain. What other trades made such demands as were made by the licensed trade on the country? What other trade was so dangerous as to necessitate the Government in self-defence granting a monopoly to it? In the public interest there could not be free trade in licences. The danger of the trade had prevented their having free trade in licences in order to destroy the monopoly, and the result was that the nation were now called upon to give an extravagant value in order to get rid of that monopoly which never ought to have been allowed to pass into private hands. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition himself had said that if they were starting *de novo* the monopoly created by public action in that trade would never be allowed to grow up. It had been asked, why should there be no compensation at the end of the reduction period. But why should there be? The compensation was not payment for a public improvement, and it was not so regarded by the authors of the Act of 1904. Their whole argument was that it was a State insurance scheme; and the premiums were paid by the trade. It was, he believed, an insurance scheme which the trade could have carried out for themselves if the Government had not instituted it. The right hon. Gentleman opposite thought it necessary to yield to the brewers and licensees who came to him.

Mr. YOUNGER: And the magistrates.

*Mr. LEIF JONES: And perhaps some magistrates, although it was on record that the right hon. Gentleman refused to receive the magistrates of Manchester, who were a reforming bench, when they asked for an interview with him. It was a mutual insurance scheme. The trade paid the insurance premiums, and now they would by this Bill receive notice that compensation would come to an end in fourteen years. When it came to an end they could institute another insurance scheme. The hon. Member for Kidderminster had asked why the Government objected to paying a little more compensation seeing that the trade themselves paid it. If it was really the case that the compensation proposed by the Government was insufficient and that the premiums of this compensation were paid by the trade, what was there to prevent the trade from carrying on alongside the scheme of the Act of 1904 a voluntary scheme of their own? He thought fourteen years was a reasonable notice to give to the trade, and at the end of the reduction period there was nothing against which they could not easily insure. His own belief was that the trade would be able to insure against the risks of the action of the magistrates in shutting up houses and imposing conditions and the action of local option for a great deal less than the compensation levy, and that the trade would be in the extra years left in a very favoured position, because then they would have only to insure against these risks and there would be no compensation levy to pay. Some complaint had been made that the seven years that would remain at the end of the reduction period could be commuted for a payment of three years monopoly value. He thought that was a misunderstanding. He did not think that the three years had anything to do with the seven years at the end of the reduction period. The three years, as he understood it, represented a sort of admission on the part of the Government that possibly fourteen years annuity was insufficient, and therefore they proposed to add three years in every case. He did not altogether agree with them in that. In fact he had voted against the seven years, and he was equally against this increased compensation. The optional reduction by the justices, the further reduction by local option, depended on there being money in the compensation fund. The Government had given an effective undertaking, in fact it was in the Bill, that except for compulsory reduction there was to be no increase of the present levy. That being so the more they increased the sum for the reduction of houses during the fourteen years, and the more they paid out for compensation, the less they would have for optional reduction and for further reduction in Wales; and for that reason he personally felt that in giving anything beyond the fourteen years—a limit which he regarded as ample, and which the Government themselves had stated to be sufficient—they were making a concession at the expense of temperance reform which they must watch with the greatest possible care. With regard to Schedule A the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kingston, who made searching criticisms and analyses of the clauses, and who, as they all knew, in his searching questions said about the worst that could be said against the Bill, agreed with them in saying that local goodwill should be included in the Schedule A assessment, and admitted that personal goodwill was excluded from that assessment. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also referred to the possible improvements which might be carried out if the house was used as licensed premises, but which improvements, if the house was closed, would be useless for any other purpose. The hon. and learned Member suggested that these improvements might be included in the Schedule A assessment. He was bound to say that he thought there was certain force in that argument. It seemed to him that occasionally such improvements might find their way into the Schedule A assessment, and he did not really see any answer to that. It did not seem to him that it would be a frequent case or that it would be a very large element in it. In such a case there was in the Bill full compensation for the loss of fixtures which were useless for any other purposes than those of a licensed house.

Mr. CAVE said he had referred to the buildings, and his point was that the occupier would not only have to pay for his improvements of the buildings under the assessment, but he would have to pay for them again under the monopoly value.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said it seemed to him that the assessment might be made applicable to fixtures—[An Hon. Member: Buildings.]—well, fixtures might be part of the building, But after all, that was a risk which practically every tenant of a house ran if he made alterations of which the landlord might afterwards deprive him. The hon. and learned Gentleman, he thought, had put his finger upon a difficulty, though he did not think that any method would be absolutely perfect. The method chosen by the Government had fewer difficulties about it than any other method which had been proposed, and certainly far less than the Kennedy judgment, which had been canvassed so much during these debates. He did not think it was in dispute any longer that the Kennedy judgment gave far more compensation than was intended by the authors of the Act of 1904. They might dispute it if they chose, but hon. Members had only to look at the speeches which were made to see that he was correct in what he said. The Home Secretary of the late Government said that compensation was given for an on-licence not on loss of business profits, but on the fact that the extinction of the licence prevented the house from being used for the purposes to which it was adapted.

Sir E. CARSON (Dublin University) said that if the hon. Member read the succeeding passages he would find that the right hon. Gentleman also said that the market value would have to be an element.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said he would come to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University, because he was perhaps more precise and clear in his language. The late Solicitor-General said—

> "What was estimated was the depreciation of property, and that was the whole basis and foundation of the Bill. It was said that the bulk of the compensation would go to the owners, who in many cases were brewers. He totally and absolutely denied it."

The right hon. Gentleman was capable and learned, but he doubted whether he could explain away those words. He had never done so yet, and they stood as a perfectly clear exposition of the intentions of the Government of that day in regard to the Act of 1904. It had been proved in the course of the debates that more than was just had been paid in compensation under the Kennedy judgment. His hon. friend beside him had given a great number of cases of compensation in respect of houses which were not paying the brewer-owners. The hon. Member for Ayr Burghs winced.

Mr. YOUNGER: I never wince.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said the hon. Member was exhibiting appearances which other Members showed when they winced. He had asked the date of those cases.

Mr. YOUNGER: And then the hon. Member winced on the other side.

*Mr. LEIF JONES said that in 1906 the Government came into power and this Bill was looming in the distance; and then what became of "The Coach and Horses," which was the mainstay of hon. Members opposite? If the fact of the election of a new Government was to make these houses unsaleable, what became of their argument? Under the Kennedy judgment the brewer-owner received more than the owner who was not a brewer. He contended that this had never been intended. Mr. Justice Kennedy himself, in dealing with the case of a house which was owned by a brewer, said that the rack rent was a fair basis of compensation value. In the case of a free house he took the difference between the value of the house licensed and the house unlicensed, and said that that was the right way to arrive at a valuation. Their contention was that when they turned to the case of a tied house, the wholesale profits of the brewers were included, and that they could not be included if the owner of the house were not a brewer. He had listened with great interest to the statement made by the hon. Member for Rutland as to brewers' profits. He hoped that they might see the speech in print so that they might be able to follow the extraordinary figures which the hon. Member gave as to the immense profits, retail and wholesale, made by the liquor trade on a barrel of beer. They were most useful figures. It was those wholesale profits to which they referred under the Kennedy judgment, profits which could not enter into a case where the owner was not a brewer. The Government in the basis they had taken had placed all owners of licences on the same footing. He believed their proposal with regard to the new assessment did justice all round, and he congratulated the Government on having chosen a definite and equitable standard of monopoly value.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has been in the painful position of voting against the Government, although it was only by way of protest; but I have always admired the enthusiasm with which the hon. Gentleman supports the predatory portions of this measure. Unless I am greatly deceived, right hon. and hon. and learned friends below him winced considerably when the hon. Member gave his own version, absolutely inconsistent with the version given two hours ago by the learned Solicitor-General, of the transmutation of what the hon. and learned Gentleman humorously called the period of seven years rest into a period of three years compensation. The Solicitor-General gave an argued defence of that period of rest, but it was wholly contradictory of the defence given almost formally on its behalf by the hon. Gentleman who now enthusiastically supports the clause. The hon. Gentleman, I need hardly say, could not get away from the Act of 1904. He was perpetually referring to it and perpetually dealing with what he conceived to be the principles of its authors. I have heard him do this before, and I confess it is with a certain feeling of jealousy I notice that every one of his colleagues who took part in the defence of the Bill of 1904 is quoted and I am never quoted. I was, as it happens, Prime Minister at the time, and the author of the Bill and the Minister principally concerned in the Bill, and I think it very hard that when the hon. Gentleman wants to explain what really were the principles that animated the Government, he thinks me beneath his notice, and never condescends to quote from any of the innumerable speeches which I made in explanation and in defence of that measure. Evidently the hon. Member's researches have been carried very far into those long debates, though I do not know whether his patience equalled that of the hon. Member for Lincoln, who told an astonished House at an earlier stage of our proceedings that he had actually sat through all the debates upon that Bill. I never admired the hon. Gentleman's enthusiasm in the cause of temperance more strongly, and I feel that if he asks sacrifices of others he is prepared to make sacrifices himself. But however that may be, anybody who reads the debates on the Licensing Bill of 1904 will admit that, whether you can or cannot pick out a phrase from its context in the speeches of any Gentleman on this bench, there can be no doubt in the minds of any impartial student of the question that the Government of the day based their whole contention upon this particular proposition, that when you take away a man's property you should pay him the market value. There is really no use in quoting from this or that speech. I did not gather that the quotation even apparently carried out the views of the hon. Gentleman, but it is a small matter. That is the broad contention on which we went.

SIR S. EVANS: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman ever used that phrase.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. and learned Gentleman probably knows far better than I do what phraseology I used. I do not in the least pretend to remember the speeches I made, though I remember the general principles on which the Government of the day acted in carrying them through. But I have not attempted to maintain a verbal consistency between my speeches then and now, and I am sure any gentleman who thinks it worth while wading through all I said then will have an advantage over myself, of which I make him a full present, and I have no doubt his ingenious researches will find out that there are verbal inconsistencies, though what they are no one has yet discovered, since, for reasons I have not been able to discover, the students have rather devoted themselves to the speeches of my hon. friends than to my own. But after all we are not dealing with the Act of 1904 now, although nobody who listened to the speech of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down would have supposed that was the case. We are dealing with the Bill of 1908, and I think everybody who has listened to the laboured defences which have been given from the other side of the propriety of dealing on the basis of Schedule A alone, apart from the question of market value—indeed substituting Schedule A for market value—will have come to the conclusion that the Government themselves do not believe in their defences. A far better defence was put forward on their behalf by the hon. Member for Westmorland than they put forward themselves—a more candid, open defence, one which really touched the facts. He said, "Well, after all, if you attempt to base your compensation either on the Kennedy judgment, or on market value, or anything like the Kennedy judgment or market value, you will not have enough money to carry out temperance reform in Wales." Temperance reform in Wales may be a very excellent thing, but if that be the reason why you are going to take Schedule A as the basis of your compensation, let the Government frankly admit that they cannot take enough money out of the pockets of the trade to carry out all the schemes they have in view on the basis of a fair and logical method of compensation, and they have therefore adopted an illogical method. They have cut their coat according to their cloth, not because they did not think the coat would be becoming, but because they could not get the necessary cloth to make it. That would be, I do not say a statesmanlike, but a quite simple and intelligent argument. Is it not a fact that, as everybody knows, the assessment under Schedule A does not represent in any sense the market value of the property, that the rating may be high in one district and not so high in another? What is the reply to that argument which nobody can deny? It is, Make it equally high in all districts. You do not do that in this Bill. This is not a general rating Bill. It is not even a Bill by which you can raise the rating of the licensed houses under Schedule A. Let us suppose that it is a Bill under which you can raise the rating on licensed houses, or that the Government think they have power through the income-tax collectors or otherwise to raise these ratings to the level which they think appropriate to the case. What a gross and indefensible injustice would thus be committed. Everybody knows that if you are going to use the rating in your Schedule A merely for the purposes of compensation it might be a possible way of doing it. You have only to raise the rating until the compensation based upon it approaches or equals the market value, and you have an equitable system. But does not everybody see that if you are going to try to get equitable compensation in that way you incidentally produce the grossest injustice in other ways? And for this plain and simple reason—that the rating for local purposes is sometimes absolutely dependent upon Schedule A, and is always practically dependent upon it. Therefore, if the Government are going to raise the rating to such a point as would make the system uniform throughout the country and approaching anything that could be described as equitable, they are actually going to require of owners of licensed premises that they should pay more than the share their neighbours pay to all local purposes. I hope the right hon. Gentleman who proposes to reply to my remarks will say whether he thinks that a just arrangement, that the valuation of licensed premises and licensed premises alone, for income-tax purposes under Schedule A, should be raised in every district above the surrounding level of Schedule A rating. If the right hon. Gentleman does not think so, how could the rating be raised, unless we had a general valuation Bill? I do not suppose the right hon. Gentleman would suggest that this Bill is not to come into operation until the Government has first devised and then passed that reform of valuation so long promised, so earnestly desired, and which still delays its coming. Supposing Schedule A is really no indication of the true market value of the premises and the Government are going to base their monopoly value upon it, it seems to me that at the end of their period they may be in danger of finding that in many cases you do not get the full monopoly value. After all, our definition of monopoly value was perfectly plain and simple. It was the difference between the value of the premises licensed and unlicensed. But that is not the definition of the Government. They have so altered it that it is impossible to see whether they are not grossly overcharging, or whether, in the long run, they may not find that a new monopoly value may grow up, because Schedule A is improperly adapted to meet the requirements of the case. The truth is that if you once take a standard which is intrinsically unfit to carry out the conditions that you intend to put upon it—which is unfit to measure that which you desire to measure, and does not supply a real ground for estimating the value—you are liable to the double danger of doing a gross injustice by charging too much or finding at the period when the monopoly value is to be absorbed by the State that you do not get the whole monopoly value after all. There is no security so long as you do not have a rational system of measuring the worth of the property you are taking away. When the learned Gentleman opposite described the period of rest, did he have in his mind the position of the unfortunate licence-holder during that period of rest? The licence-holder after the fourteen years has elapsed will have, or be liable to have, new conditions put upon him by the magistrates. He will be in a position from which the Act of 1904 relieved him, or intended to relieve him, namely, the arbitrary action of particular teetotal benches of magistrates, and in addition he will be exposed to the action of the parochial authorities, who may at any moment take away the whole of his property. That is the period of rest promised to the licence-holder by the Government after the fourteen years. I am not surprised to find that the seven years period of rest is valued at three years purchase. I will not say that they have shown a fair estimate of the boon they are giving to the licence-holder. But, at all events, do not let them go about the country and say that they have modified in a generous spirit their original proposal of fourteen years by adding another seven years without payment to the compensation fund. Their own estimate of their own performance will be sufficient answer to their profession. There is one more question upon which I should like some information from the Government. They propose to deal by way of compensation not merely with the holders of licences, but with the managers of licensed houses. I am entirely in favour of the managers being generously dealt with. I should like to know on what principle the Government are acting in this matter. Do they propose to give the market value of any possession which the managers have, or is it something outside the market value of anything the managers may have lost? I understand that the licence-holder is to get less than the market value. Is the manager to be treated in the same way or in a different way? If in a different way, on what principle? We have never been told about that. We have been told indeed that the Government, with a speculative eye directed not so much to the fundamental principles underlying their Bill as to the electoral consequences which they anticipate, are dealing with great generosity towards the managers. That is all excellent. But let us know what the underlying principles are. Observe that when you know what the principles are when the Government are dealing with the managers we shall be able to see whether they are consistent in the manner in which they are dealing with other persons interested. We have always contended that you ought to give a man market value for what you take from him. Is that the principle? I want to know whether they are dealing with managers on the market value, or on something else with no relation to market value at all. That is not the only question I wish to ask about the managers. The view of the Government is that any manager dispossessed within fourteen years should have a solatium. With that we all sympathise, but I do not quite understand, and perhaps I never shall understand, why a manager should have compensation before fourteen years and not after fourteen years. Why not after fourteen years? Is it temperance in Wales again that stands in the way? I really am very much puzzled by this. There is clearly danger to the managers under local option, which comes in at the end of fourteen years. If the managers have—and I am sure the Government have concluded they have—some equitable right to compensation, why does that cease after the fourteen years? We are not talking of accumulating assurance and reserve by the trade against possible loss; these managers are not capitalists in any sense of the word, and therefore you cannot ask them to accumulate capital to the end of fourteen years. If that is so, on what grounds of justice should people whom you think ought to have compensation up to fourteen years, be handed over after fourteen years to the arbitrary action of these licensing benches and local authorities? Necessarily I speak in ignorance, because so far the Government have not told us what principle they are acting upon in regard to that. I am quite sure the First Lord of the Admiralty will tell us in a perfectly clear manner exactly the case, and the whole equities upon which the Government are proceeding, and we shall be able to judge whether these equities suddenly cease at the end of fourteen years, or if they do not. One other subject I want to ask about is this. The right hon. Gentleman is connected with the greatest spending department of the Government, the production of ships and warlike stores. There must be a large number of estimable public servants in the position of managers in the Government employment, and I should be glad to know whether the principle exists of giving compensation when work is stopped, at Woolwich, for instance, and, if not, whether it would be a good thing to extend to a class of workmen not less deserving than the managers of licensed premises, the principles which the Government embody in this Bill. I am sure the Government will recognise that I put these questions not with a view of raising meticulous objections. I really want to know what we have not been told exactly—the ethical basis of this compensation. This is the only speech I shall trouble the House with upon Clause 10 of the Bill. The truth is, I do not attach myself anything like the same importance to this clause as I did, for instance, to the clause we discussed yesterday, because, as the money is raised in the way we know from the people you are plundering, it really is not a question more or less of injustice to the class as a whole, but as to the distribution of the injustice among the different members of that class. The Government in the earlier clause of the Bill have chosen to act like sixteenth century buccaneers levying forced contribution on some city in the West Indies. The House is now discussing not the amount of the contribution or the honesty of those who levied it, but the method of apportionment among the unhappy inhabitants. Though that may be of considerable importance, it is not nearly as fundamental as the question whether you should have levied a forced contribution at all. When we have once agreed to the earlier clauses by which this gross act of injustice was perpetrated all the questions raised in Clause 10 are necessarily of a subordinate character. They deal with the question of whether "A" is robbed more than "B," or "B" more than "A," and not with the question of whether the robbery ought ever to have been committed. Though the questions of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Kingston and some questions I have put are of great interest and importance, and are deserving of a much fuller answer than they have yet received, I have to admit that the problem we are discussing to-night is far less fundamental than the great question we discussed yesterday. It is rather the comparatively insignificant balancing of relative injustices than the consideration as to whether you are going to pass a just or an unjust Bill in itself. Whatever decision the Government may come to on these points, it cannot mitigate the objection we feel to the whole scope and purpose of the Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I had no intention of intervening in this debate, because my hon and learned friend appeared to me to cover the whole ground in relation to this clause; but as the right hon. Gentleman has addressed certain questions directly to me, I rise at once to give him an answer to the best of my ability. The last question put by the right hon. Gentleman was a very interesting one. As I understand it, he says that under this Bill the Government propose to compel brewers to pay compensation to their servants in a business in which those servants are engaged, in public-houses closed by reason of the licence being taken away. Without challenging our action, the right hon. Gentleman asks, if this method of procedure is right under this Bill, why it is not right that the State as an employer of labour, if it discontinues any work at Woolwich or elsewhere, should pay compensation to its discharged servants.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; I did put that question. I also put another question, which was—Why should you stop at fourteen years?

MR. MCKENNA: The question is—If we compel brewers to pay compensation to their managers if they are dispossessed of their work, why do the Government not do the same in the case of State employment? Whether we are right or wrong in proposing to give compensation to these managers, we are only extending the same principle as the right hon. Gentleman himself adopted in the Act of 1904. Under that Act the Leader of the Opposition himself admitted that the holder of the licence was entitled to compensation, and the only difference between our Bill and that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman is not one of principle, but the Government now propose to give managers a more adequate and reasonable compensation than was proposed in the Act of 1904. Therefore, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman rather to direct his question to himself. If he considered in the case of this particular trade which he was defending in 1904 that these people have suffered through the abolition of the licence and were entitled to receive compensation, why did he not give compensation to discharged State servants when he was Prime Minister? I can only assure him that the present Government are acting upon precisely the same principle as he did in the course they have adopted. It is only when the manager is the licence-holder that he receives compensation, and, as a matter of fact, under the right hon. Gentleman's own Bill at this moment compensation is paid to the manager when the licence is withdrawn; so that, whatever objection the right hon. Gentleman may have, it can only be an objection to the amount of compensation, and not to the principle which we have borrowed from himself. Then he asks—If it is right that managers should get compensation now, why should they not also receive compensation on the expiration of the fourteen years period? The answer on that point is extremely simple. The closing of a certain number of licensed premises under the operation of this Bill will take place by statute. It is compulsory, and it is conceded that, although the right to compensation has never been admitted, in the circumstances it is a case in which compensation might be properly given. It is regarded that this operation of compulsory closing is to affect a great trade in a summary manner, and that the individuals who suffer may reasonably receive compensation. But we establish no new principle. The moment the trade reverts to the old condition as it was before the Act of 1904——

MR. BARNARD: What about local option and magisterial discretion?

MR. McKENNA: Magisterial discretion existed before 1904, and the only change is the condition of local option. That risk is insurable, and the risk which the licence-holders may have to ensure themselves against is one which, I am bound to say, in my judgment will not involve a very heavy premium. The point we are considering now is why at the end of fourteen years the State does not compel the brewers to compensate their servants if a licence is taken away from them. We are here not establishing a new principle. We are going back to the position in which the law stood prior to 1904 when the magistrates could take away a licence at their discretion. No compensation was then given or asked for, and we conceived that there was no need for introducing such an alteration into the present Bill. The right hon. Gentleman asked us for a fuller, or at any rate a clearer, explanation why the period of three years was added when the valuation was taken for compensation. The view of the Government in this matter is a very simple one. Following the principle of this Bill we conceive that if a licence is cancelled during the next fourteen years it is a licence which is redundant and ought not to exist. We say that it is properly taken away, and that if nothing but bare justice was done no compensation would be given. The principle of compensation has been admitted, and it is considered that the law will work more smoothly if compensation is paid. The Government had to consider what amount of compensation should be given. The period of reduction is fourteen years, and we conceived that the proper period for ascertaining the factor by which the monopoly value should be determined would be the present value of the remaining number of years. Very well, that was the Bill as originally introduced—perfectly clear and perfectly consistent. Violent opposition was raised to that part of the Bill under which the monopoly value was to be taken at the end of the period of fourteen years. There is obviously no necessary connection between the period when the monopoly value should be taken and the period of the suppression of the licence. In answer to the violent attacks which were made on that part of the Bill, the Prime Minister gave a period of seven years during which no monopoly value would be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A period of rest.

MR. McKENNA: The right hon. Gentleman will allow me to state the facts exactly as they are. I have never spoken of it as a period of rest; and if it was spoken of as such by my hon. and learned friend, I take it that it was only a period of rest in the respect that no monopoly value would be taken. The great argument against the Bill has been that by taking the monopoly value at the end of fourteen years the Government did not give the trade time to make a compensation fund in order to meet the loss. Well, for that purpose the additional period of seven years was given—a period, I will not say of rest to the trade, inasmuch as it remains subject to the very necessary control of the justices—but a period during which they can make provision for the loss of the monopoly value. The position then was this. If a licence was taken away in the last year of the reduction period, that was to say, in the fourteenth year—and inasmuch as it was only taken away in the fourteenth year, it was on the border line of those licences which should be suppressed by law—the holder of such licence would find himself, in the fourteenth year, deprived of compensation; whereas, if he had only survived the fourteenth year, he would have had a seven years certain run, only subject to the discretion of the magistrates to take away the licence, and to local option. Therefore, in the thirteenth or fourteenth year of the reduction period he would have conceived himself suffering from a great injustice owing to the fact of these seven years being granted as a concession to the trade. The Government felt that the claim of those licence-holders who lost their licences during the ending years of the reduction period would be very strong to have some compensation given in addition to that for the short term of the reduction period still unexpired when their licences were extinguished. Accordingly it was determined that some general addition should be given to the whole of the compensation for all classes of licences, but in such a way that those licence-holders whose licences were extinguished in the last year or two would reap the greatest advantage. The addition of three years to the present value gave a very small amount of additional compensation to those licence-holders whose licences were extinguished in the earlier years of the reduction period, while those licence-holders whose licences were extinguished in the last years of the reduction period would get almost the whole of the three years. We had been asked. Why three years? Why not two years, or why not four years? The principle on which the period of three years was settled was—I will not say very simple, but it was settled upon an estimate of what could be done with the money available out of the present compensation levy. I remember that the hon. Member for Kidderminster, on the Committee stage of the Bill, was strongly of opinion that the present compensation levy would leave a large balance over at the end of the reduction period after paying all compensation, and for such additional reductions as the justices might make. Although the Government do not agree with the hon. Member's estimate, still, so far as we could make an estimate in this very uncertain matter, we did consider that the funds at the disposal of the Commission will enable them to pay such extra amount of compensation all round without any increase on the existing amount of the compensation levy, and consequently the Government, actuated by those principles, and those principles only, have added three years to the compensation period. The last challenge which the Leader of the Opposition addressed to us was as to how we could reasonably justify Schedule A as the proper valuation for determining the monopoly value. If the right hon. Gentleman will excuse my saying so, he seemed to be somewhat in error as to our system of assessment. There is at the present time, as he knows, an assessment for the Poor Law and an assessment for Schedule A. Except in London, these two assessments are not the same. It would be perfectly possible to increase the assessment for Schedule A without increasing the assessment for the Poor Law, and, therefore, without increasing the assessment for the ordinary rates in the rest of the country except London. In London there is uniformity between the two assessments, and, therefore, the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's argument, which was directed to show that if you increase the assessment of Schedule A you will increase the assessment for rating purposes, and that the wretched holders of licensed premises will be rated more than their neighbours, has not really any substantial basis.

MR. BARNARD: The assessment committees have the right under the Union Assessment Act of access to Schedule A, and they invariably use it when it suits their purpose.

MR. McKENNA: I can assure the hon. Member that the assessment committees do not use Schedule A, taking the whole of the country through. If you take the assessment under Schedule A all over the country you will find that the total is materially in excess of the total assessment for the Poor Law.

MR. BARNARD: I am chairman of a committee within twenty-five miles of London, and we invariably take the Schedule A assessment.

MR. McKENNA: I have no doubt that my hon. friend endeavours to get the assessment in his area as high as he can.

MR. BARNARD: I endeavour to take it at the proper amount.

MR. McKENNA: It cannot be argued that the assessment for Schedule A is the same, or need be the same, as the assessment for Poor Law. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition went on to say that to increase the assessment under Schedule A would be exceptionally hard on the holders of licensed premises, because even under Schedule A they would have to pay something else besides the compensation levy. Under Schedule A they would be taxed at a larger amount if their assessment were raised. We are agreed on this side that licensed premises have been to a considerable extent under-assessed. The reason has been that in too many cases the assessing authorities have taken the rent as a guide, and in the case of tied licensed premises the rent is not a true guide to the value. Personally, I have not a doubt that the effect of this Bill, if it becomes law, will be to ensure that licensed premises are assessed at their proper value; that the assessment authorities will look behind the rents paid to the brewers who own the premises, and will look at the true value of the premises, and that Schedule A will form a true guide to the monopoly value. We contend that Schedule A valuation of licensed premises, with a time-limit, corresponds to their market value as a place of retail trade. I can assure the hon. Member for Kidderminster that we believe that Schedule A assessment subject to certain limitations—that is to say, with a time-limit and a measure of the retail trade added—furnishes a just and simple means of determining market value. Let me remind the hon. Gentleman that until the Kennedy judgment under the Act of 1904 the principle of this Bill was the identical principle adopted by the Inland Revenue of that day in determining the market value of the licence. We have adopted exactly the same method as was pursued by the Inland Revenue authorities whilst the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition was himself Prime Minister.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, no; the right hon. Gentleman must not say that. He implies that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that time was in some way responsible for the action of the Inland Revenue authorities. He must know quite well that that was not the case.

MR. McKENNA: If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me I will complete my sentence. I was saying that while he was himself Prime Minister, had the action been so startlingly unfair and such a gross breach of justice as he suggests, it would have been brought to his notice, and would have constrained him to introduce an amendment to his own Bill. It is perfectly true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day had no responsibility for the administrative action of the Inland Revenue officials, but if it had been so gross an injustice as the right hon. Gentleman says it is, surely a complaint would have been made to him, and he would have felt it his duty, responsible as he was for the Act of 1904, to have introduced an amending Bill at the first opportunity.

MR. CAVE said an appeal was brought in respect of one of the first licensed houses to be assessed. The remedy was to go to the High Court, and that remedy was adopted by the owners.

MR. McKENNA: It is perfectly true that a case was brought to the High Court, but it was not soon after the passing of the Act; the case was not tried until the middle of 1906.

MR. CAVE: It related to a house assessed in 1905.

MR. McKENNA: These gross injustices affecting the property of individuals, if they are gross injustices, are never borne silently; and if there had been gross injustices, the trade would have represented those injustices to the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day. I never heard in the House of Commons that any question was raised with regard to the monopoly value as measured by the Inland Revenue Commissioners of the day, and I am bound to say that the whole of the present attack on the principle which the Government has adopted is not justified by the experience of what was done in 1904, or by the defence of that measure made from the Treasury bench. It is quite true that in quoting various speeches made in 1904 from the Treasury bench none were quoted as having been made by the right hon. Gentleman himself, for the very good reason that the right hon. Gentleman himself never expressed any opinion on the point one way or the other. Two hon. friends of mine have been good enough to go through his speeches on this part of that Act, and they find that he was judiciously silent upon it. Therefore, if we turn from him to those gentlemen who spoke on his behalf, if he does not repudiate them, we are bound to consider the statements of those gentlemen as the authoritative statements of the Government of the day upon the subject. Guiding ourselves by the principles laid down in the Act of 1904 by our predecessors, and guiding ourselves by the practice of the Inland Revenue Commissioners in their construction of the Act of 1904, we are entitled to say that whatever construction may subsequently have been placed upon the Act by a Judge, the Government in this respect are following the principles in that Act. The fundamental difference is that the authors of the Act of 1904 gave a larger number of years purchase, while we are limiting the compensation to fourteen years purchase. I will conclude by saying that we do think that in taking away, not what the right hon. Gentleman calls a man's property, but an expectation we are giving them the full market value for what we are taking away.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) wished to say a word as to an expression used at an early period of the debate by the Solicitor-General. The hon. and learned Gentleman described the seven years which followed the reduction period as a period of rest. He really thought that there could not have been a worse description of that period.

SIR S. EVANS: What I meant by the phrase was a period of rest for brewers from the burden of paying compensation and the burden of paying monopoly value.

MR. JAMES HOPE said that a period of rest was not an accurate description; it might be a period of relief. The licence-holders would be subject to the fear of local option and of justices' discretion, and also to the fact that they would have the prospect of an annual fight before the licensing authorities and the great probability of having during two periods of the term to fight the local vetoists. Therefore, to describe it as a period of rest was, he submitted, a most complete misnomer. It would not be a period of rest but a period of nightmare; a period in which the unhappy licence-holder would know for certain that in seven years at the most the guillotine of monoply value would come down upon him, and that in the meantime he would be subject to the risk of being privately assassinated by the licensing justices, or being taken out by a mob of local vetoists and summarily lynched. He knew that the defenders of the Bill could quote from various authorities exactly what suited them and no more. For example, in the long discussion raised about the Kennedy judgment, the Solicitor-General in defending the Bill, spoke as if the contention of the Inland Revenue Commissioners at the time when this particular case was argued before Mr. Justice Kennedy was perfectly correct, and was unfairly and unjustly brushed aside by Mr. Justice Kennedy in his judgment. What was their contention? It was that while it was true that Schedule A should be adopted as a basis of compensation, there should be twenty-five years purchase allowed. He asked the hon. and learned Gentleman if he would be willing to grant to licence-holders, or if the hon. Member for Westmorland would be willing to grant to licence-holders twenty-five years purchase of the difference between the premises as licensed and unlicensed under Schedule A. It was no use attacking the Kennedy judgment and quoting the basis taken by the Inland Revenue unless they adopted the whole contention of the Inland Revenue, and took the twenty-five years purchase as a basis. The hon. Member for Aberdeenshire said that he had no objection to taking the market value. He himself did not contend for a moment that all the procedure started in consequence of the Kennedy judgment was necessarily right. Possibly it might not be a right way of arriving at market value. All he contended for was that the market value should be taken as a basis of compensation, and if the hon. and learned Gentleman offered them (he was not speaking as a representative of the brewing interest) twenty-five years purchase of the difference between licensed and unlicensed value, he would admit that in the great majority of cases that would be a very handsome and large addition to the basis of compensation actually adopted in the Bill. But it would not be so in all cases. There would be some cases in which anything like that basis would entirely break down. The hon. Member for Kidderminster quoted two instances in which the unlicensed value according to Schedule A was greater than the licensed value. When the discussion on this point was opened in Committee he quoted various other cases to the same effect. They were challenged by the hon. Member for Lincoln, but he reiterated the figures that he then gave, which showed that in certain instances, especially in the Metropolitan area, there were licensed premises in which, owing to improvement in position or site, or the particular position of the premises concerned, the unlicensed value was greater than the licensed value. As he had said the hon. Member for Kidderminster had quoted other instances. What was the result? The result was that in those cases no compensation was to be paid at all, and very curious consequences would follow from that. He knew the hon. Member for Lincoln, who was not then in his place, challenged his figures at that time, and he hoped some hon. friend would repeat to the hon. Member the statement that those figures were not the figures of any odd valuer. The figures were supplied by Messrs. Orgill Marks and Company, but they were not their figures, but agreed figures as to the value of the premises under Schedule A, and what was their value unlicensed—they were agreed figures for compensation under the Act of 1904, before any of these present questions involved in this Bill were raised, and the hon. Member could not say that these were in any sense fancy figures. They proved in several cases in the Metropolitan area that the unlicensed value under Schedule A was larger than the licensed value and that consequently no compensation would be payable under the operation of this Bill at all. Yet when it came to the goodwill and the question of trade and value, these profits would be absolutely and entirely eliminated. He wanted to draw the attention of the hon. and learned Gentleman to what he had described as a curious consequence of the wording of this clause. He did not want to speak dogmatically, but at any rate he thought it was a point to which the hon. and learned Gentleman should devote his attention. He questioned whether any licence-holder or manager would get any compensation whatever, owing to the way in which Section 10 had been drafted. The section ran—

> "Where compensation is payable in respect of the extinction of an old on-licence the amount payable shall be determined by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue and shall be such sum as will purchase (with interest reckoned at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum) an immediate annuity for the unexpired years of the reduction period equal in amount to the annual value of the licence as ascertained under this section with the addition of such sums (if any) as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue think just to add."

When they got the sum equal in amount to the annual value of the licence they had to look at subsection (2) and there it said—

> "The annual value of the licence shall be taken to be the sum by which the actual annual value of the licensed premises, as adopted for the purpose of income-tax under Schedule A at the time when the renewal of the licence is refused, exceeds the amount which the Commissioners of Inland Revenue determine, for the purpose of this section, would be the annual value of the premises for that purpose if the premises were not licensed."

But in these instances the unlicensed value was greater than the licensed value. Therefore no compensation would be paid and if no compensation would be paid what would the meaning of the words "with the addition of such sums (if any) as the Commissioners of Inland Revenue think just to add"? If there were no sums payable for compensation there could be no addition of any sums to the licence-holders, and therefore under these particular conditions it seemed to him that, under the drafting of this section, although he did not say it was the intention of the section, the licence-holder would get nothing at all, although he in many cases, if he were an ordinary tenant or if he were the manager, would not be concerned with the annual value under Schedule A. He would not in any way be concerned with that, and yet he would entirely lose his livelihood.

Sir S. EVANS: I think there are words which are better than the words "with the addition of" because that implies, I think, that there is something to add to. Therefore I have already got an Amendment on the Paper to leave out the words "with the addition of" and to insert the word "and." What the hon. Member says would be met by that change.

Mr. James Hope.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said he was glad that the Solicitor-General had seen that point, because otherwise there would be danger that the licence-holder would get nothing. But he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman must go further and add that where there was any compensation payable the licence-holder must get this amount. Then he thought that there must be a consequential Amendment in the next clause where "additional sums" were spoken of. He thought the hon. and learned Gentleman would require some further words at line 22 of Clause 11.

Sir S. EVANS was understood to say that that point had also been met. At any rate it was not his fault if it had not.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said he was very glad that he was justified in his criticism on the clause as it stood and that the hon. and learned Gentleman would take care that the actual manager or tenant of the premises did not suffer. But this was one proof out of twenty that the original draft of the Bill left a good deal to be desired. The hon. Member for Aberdeenshire had said that under the present circumstances the licence which was reduced was really in respect of premises which were of no value at all, and he suggested quite distinctly that the reason why this was done was that the brewers or owners concerned managed to get a particular house put before the licensing justices in the first instance, and thereby secured compensation for premises which were of no value at all. It was quite easy to put forward exoteric knowledge of the number of wicked things that were done in the world, and especially in the licensing world, but he did not think there was any foundation for this charge at all. At any rate he submitted that the hon. Member ought not to have made such a statement unless he could put forward some grounds upon which it could be vindicated, but the hon. Member did nothing of the kind. His own experience in this matter was limited. He did not profess to be a specially active justice, but he knew the practice of his own bench, which was that the magistrates took a survey of all the licences in their area without exception. They sent two of their number to report on the licences in each parish. The whole of the licences reported on were brought up to the bench and carefully considered in the light of that report, and to suppose that any priority was given to any one licence rather than to another, and to suggest that the owners of those licences had any means, or if they had any means would have exercised them, of bringing one particular licence before the justices sooner than another, was, he believed, absolutely false and there was not a particle of evidence to support it. He supposed that what had been the practice of the bench to which he belonged had been the practice of all the benches in the country, and he was sorry that the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire should from his place in Parliament have said what he had. The hon. Member ought not to have made that insinuation without giving some evidence in support of it. Now let him say a word about the question of assessment. It was suggested that in order to secure more compensation the owners of licensed premises ought voluntarily to promote a rise in their own assessments. On what possible principle could this be argued? The owners of licensed premises apart from the possibility of local option and reduction, would still remain, at any rate to the extent of two-thirds of the existing licences, up to the end of the reduction period. It was a little unfortunate that there was no member of the Government at present in charge of this Bill, so he supposed he must address his remarks to the hon. Member for Westmoreland, as the Treasury Bench was for the moment deserted. Under ordinary circumstances he should move the adjournment of the debate, but he supposed he might take it that for the moment the hon. Member for Westmoreland was in charge of the Bill.

Mr. LEIF-JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said his hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General whispered to him that he had been fetched out, but that he would be back in a moment.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said that from the fact that the hon. and learned Gentleman whispered to the hon. Member he would take it that he left him in charge of the Bill. At the end of the reduction period the licensed premises existing would be two-thirds of the present number; roughly speaking, one-third would have been extinguished. Now it was suggested that all the licence-holders should voluntarily bring about an increase of their own assessment, although at the end of the period only one-third of the licencees would have been abolished. That was a preposterous suggestion, because if their assessments were raised, they would pay more for the compensation levy and more for local rates, and they did not know whether they would be affected by these compensation proposals at all. But apart from that it was not fair to put upon any individual the obligation to bring about a change in the assessment which might be made against him. If the assessment was too low, it ought to be put right by the public authority, but no attempt should be made to put the onus of raising it upon the owner.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) called attention to the fact that not a single Member of the Government was present, and that not forty Members were present.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. Caldwell, Lanarkshire, Mid.) said that at that period of the evening (the dinner hour) under the Standing Orders a count could not be taken.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said he felt some difficulty in addressing the House when no responsible Member of the Government was present and when the hon. Member for Westmoreland could not reply and had no authority. With regard to the question of assessment, he would come to what was really the fundamental fault of the clause, which had been alluded to by the hon. Member for Sleaford and others in the course of their argument. The fundamental fault of the clause was, that amend it as they would, they could only shift the basis of injustice. They did not relieve the burden under such circumstances. They only shifted it. If it were only a question of compensation without any reference to the further point of to whom the compensation was to be paid, he should then submit that not only Schedule A, but Schedule D should come into question, but as it was they were met with this difficulty. If they increased the compensation they increased the charge of the levy, and if they increased the charge of the levy they added to the burden on the other licence-holders. In either way there was an injustice. The fundamental defect of the Bill was that this clause was so peculiarly framed that any attempt to amend it would simply shift the injustice from one part to another. The Opposition contended that the compensation was too little and that it ought to be increased. But the only means of increasing it would be by making a higher charge on the levy, which meant that a greater burden would be put upon the other licensees. As had been pointed out, that was justifiable under the Act of 1904, because the extinction of licences then resulted in an enhancement of the value of those that remained. That was not so under this Bill. However much they tried to amend this clause, it could not be made to work justly; and the fact that the clauses of the Bill were so interdependent only emphasised the injustices which were so interwoven that any attempt to amend the clause would only put a further burden on the shoulders of a deserving, respectable, and highly taxed section of the community. They were entitled to emphasise that point and to say that, though no Amendment would make it right, still they had demonstrated the injustice of the Bill. He hoped that nothing would be left of it but waste-paper with which they might light their Christmas fires.

AN HON. MEMBER called attention to the fact that there was no member of the Government in the House, and moved the adjournment of the debate.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid.) said that under the Resolution of the House relating to this Bill he could not accept such a Motion.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) complained that the hon. Member for Appleby, who sat behind the hon. and learned Solicitor-General, and was apparently advising the Government, had said, in answer to the hon. and learned Member for Kingston who had so dissected this Bill—

> "We know the worst that can be said of this clause."

The only natural construction that could be put on those words was that the hon Member was speaking for the Government.

MR. LEIF JONES said he spoke on behalf of the supporters of the Government.

*MR. REES said the hon. Member had no right to speak for them or for the majority of the House or for the majority on his own side of the House. He was no doubt entitled to speak for the majority, possibly a large one, of the electors of Appleby, but for no one else except himself. He asserted that the hon. Member by the use of the word "we" did speak for the Government.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) on a point of order, asked if the hon. Member was speaking to the Amendment.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said he thought that the hon. Member's personal remarks were going too far.

*MR. REES pointed out that he only wished to protest against anyone using the word "we" outside His Majesty's Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition, but he would not pursue the matter. The Leader of the Opposition seemed to have been a little exercised in his mind that under the joint operation of the Bill and the income-tax Schedule A, Wales might get a little more money than he thought she was entitled to. If Wales should get a little more money than she was exactly entitled to, there would be no great harm, seeing how much she gave to the rest of Great Britain and how little she received.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER pointed out that the remarks of the hon. Member had no bearing on the Amendment before the House.

*MR. REES regretted that he should have been so unfortunate as twice to be called to order. If it was not in order to discuss the position of Wales under the section, he had no desire to pursue the matter further. He had presumed that what was in order for the Leader of the Opposition was in order for himself.

*MR. YOUNGER said that the First Lord of the Admiralty had endeavoured to make the very strong point against the trade that they had calmly suffered an injustice until some period in 1906, when the High Court gave a decision. As a matter of fact, the moment Sir Henry Primrose's memorandum was issued the trade authorities protested against it as being grossly unfair and entirely out of harmony with what they believed to be the principle of Section 4 of the Act, and so impressed were the Inland Revenue authorities with that protest that they arranged with the trade protection society to take an agreed on case to the High Court in order to have the point settled. Surely the right hon. Gentleman must have known perfectly well that the ordinary licence-holder was hardly in a position to go to the High Court. As a matter of fact, it cost over £2,000 to pay the costs of getting the decision by Mr. Justice Kennedy. That was by no means an excessive sum of money to fight a case of that description. It included the costs of both sides. He made that statement on behalf of the trade in order to controvert, at the earliest possible moment, the statement by the First Lord of the Admiralty, which no doubt was made in entire ignorance of what was now stated. So far as the First Lord of the Admiralty's impassioned sentences dealt with this particular part of the question, they were quite uncalled for, unnecessary, and wholly irrelevant. He expressed his regret that Clause 10, as now drafted and settled, appeared to be the last word of the Government on the question. He thought the Government should have done something to modify the harshness of the clause. Apparently they had no intention of doing so. That was surprising, because if the discussions in Committee had done anything at all they had brought home to the supporters of the Government some appreciation of the harsh and ruthless clauses of the Bill. He had a copy of a letter written to *The Times* soon after the introduction of the Bill, in which the writer, the hon. Member for Sleaford, said that the argument was used that the Bill would entirely destroy the property of brewers after fourteen years. The hon. Member proceeded—

> "For that reason, I understand, he (the hon. Member for the Walton division of Liverpool) opposes the Bill. . . . I should have thought that if the effect of the Bill were entirely to destroy the property of the breweries and distilleries, it would be the most beneficent measure that had ever been introduced into Parliament, and would have the support of all good men of all parties."

Let the House compare that with the sentence in the speech delivered by the hon. Gentleman to-day, in which he pleaded for greater generosity, and regretted that by the passage of this clause a sense of injustice would be left behind. He was bound to say that he was surprised and bitterly disappointed that the Government had not done something to modify the ruthless injustice of the Bill. Under the Act of 1904, the market value of the premises was given as compensation, but under the provisions of this clause they were taking away a man's entire business and giving him a mere solatium in return—a derisory compensation. It had been claimed by the Prime Minister and also by the Solicitor-General that the trade had really no reason to complain, because the basis of compensation which had been adopted by the Government was the same as that which had been taken for monopoly value. But to start with, Clause 10 dispossessed a man of his livelihood at the end of fourteen years. They were taking from him everything which he possessed, everything on which he had to live. They were taking his personal goodwill as well as his local goodwill, and all those other accumulations of capital which had been the result of his energy and hard work. Surely while the basis taken by the Government might be perfectly fair in regard to monopoly value—he would not argue that now—it was no argument in the world for using that basis to compensate a man for the loss not only of monopoly value, but of goodwill and everything else. The hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire had made a speech which was somewhat astonishing. He had talked as if there were no objection to giving the market value, but that he did not know how it was to be ascertained; and he then discussed the proposition of the Government from the point of view that they were going to give ten and a half years purchase for what they were taking. It was not anything like ten and a half years purchase. Ten and a half years purchase on that particular basis of the valuation in no sense represented the value of the property, profit, or anything else. How the hon. Gentleman could possibly find any foundation for a proposition of that kind was more than he could understand in one of his acuteness and knowledge. That, however, was what the hon. Gentleman had said, and it led him to think that there was still in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite very great confusion indeed as to what was the real effect of Clause 10. There was not, he was afraid, in the minds of the trade the slightest doubt as to the very great burden it placed upon them, nor about the very heavy losses which would be incurred by them. They would have to provide for these losses within a comparatively short period of years, and he feared that the extra period which had been offered to them at the end of that time would not do very much to help them over the stile. "The period of rest," as it was so inaptly described by the hon. and learned Gentleman, was a period without the payment of compensation for loss or withdrawal, and, if he were asked to define a state of purgatory so far as the publican was concerned, he could not find a better one than the position in which he would be placed under the seven years so-called free run for the insurance of the loss of monopoly value which the Government were now going to give him. The hon. Member for Appleby who had gone into the question of rent, no doubt had in his mind the speech made by the hon. Member for Lincoln when this clause was under discussion some time ago, and when the hon. Member for Lincoln brought before the House some very startling figures as to what he considered the deficiency in the valuation of licensed premises under Schedule A for the purpose of income-tax. The Schedule A valuation was an extremely difficult problem. He intended to say something about it when the Prime Minister's new definition of monopoly value was before the House, and he had in fact said some words about its effect on public-houses in Scotland. He did not recede from anything he then said, but he had been making inquiries since about this particular system of valuation under Schedule A, and he found that there had been a very great change in the valuation of public-houses under Schedule A, in consequence of a recent decision of the Court of Session in a succession duty case. In making the assessment of public-houses there was more and more a tendency to add the personal goodwill to the local goodwill. He supposed that the hon. Member for Appleby would think it unfair to pay compensation on that method, just as it was extremely unfair to take as the local monopoly value the result of a valuation which included something which was not local but personal to the man carrying on the business. Therefore, the arguments which had been used that day about the policy of adopting Schedule A for this purpose or the other, were arguments which were much more forcible perhaps than those who used them were well aware of. This system had been in operation many years in Scotland, and in the hands of Government assessors. The alterations upon it had been so great that one of the most prominent assessors in Scotland told him the other day that he did not believe the Schedule A valuation, as used in Scotland, would be at all a fair basis for charging monopoly value to publicans in Scotland or elsewhere. So that the Schedule A valuation presented a far greater difficulty than hon. Members opposite were aware of. They had heard three versions of the Government's proposal of the fixing of a three years annuity for the seven years period. They had the version given by the Solicitor-General, they had the version of the hon. Member for Appleby, and they had the version of the First Lord of the Admiralty. He did not know that any two of them entirely agreed. He thought the most interesting and perhaps the most correct was the version given by the hon. Member for Appleby, who, they were told, spoke for himself and not for anybody else. There was one very important factor connected with the seven years which had not been mentioned, and it was this, that at the end of the fourteen years all the licences dealt with would be treated as new licences. A man would not know whether he would get his licence again; he would have to fight for it. At present, the renewal was subjected to none of the conditions which might then be attached to it by the justices; and the man would have to fear local option, which was hanging over him, and also the untrammelled discretion of the magistrates; although hon. Gentlemen opposite had pointed out, as against this, that there would be the compensation levy which had been accumulating during a possible seven years run against the insurance of the loss of monopoly value. From its being an argument in support of the generosity of this extension of seven years in regard to taking the monopoly value, this saving had now become merely an instrument for the insurance of the publican against the risk of losing his licence during the seven years; so that what was compensation now merely became an insurance fee for the chance of carrying on the business after the end of the seven years—the gracious permission and authority of hon. Gentlemen opposite for the shadow of hope of existence. He doubted very much whether it would be possible to insure. He knew that before the Act of 1904, when justices were refusing licences on account of redundancy or for other such reasons, insurance companies which had suffered losses from this risk, in later years absolutely refused to insure against it. He believed it was a fact whatever hon. Gentlemen might say that they absolutely refused to insure that risk. He did not know about Lloyd's, but Lloyd's did not always pay, and he did not think a Lloyd's policy was as a rule regarded as quite as good a security as the policies of some of the larger insurance companies.

MR. LEIF JONES: Very much better than the Licences Insurance Corporation.

*MR. YOUNGER said it depended on the names on the policy. Even Lloyd's he thought would find some difficulty in making a quotation for a policy which not only covered loss from redundancy, but all the other risks of local veto, and one thing and another. He knew what the experience of licence-holders was in the years before 1904, and he saw no reason to suppose that that position would be improved in the seven years after 1923. Therefore, he did not think there would be a possible insurance. In this clause the Government had shown a carelessness of ordinarily decent generosity which, to his mind, was colossal. They were dealing in Clause 10 with a levy provided by the trade itself. They did not even show generosity with other people's money. No doubt it arose largely from the fact that they had adopted a scheme of compulsory reduction, the results of which they had not taken the trouble to make themselves or the House acquainted with. They did not know how many licences would go under the scheme. They had no idea of the calls which would be made upon licence holders for compensation, and, therefore, they were obliged to alter wholly not only the basis on which they were going to pay compensation but also to make the fund national instead of local in its working. That last change made an enormous difference. Under the present Act those who paid compensation for the reduction of licences were receiving some benefit, in some cases large benefit, from the cancellation of the licences which were taken away. If there were 1,000 licences in a particular locality and they took away 300, would those who remained have gained no advantage through the closing of these houses?

*SIR THOMAS WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): What I was thinking of was a large county. You may have contributors paying in parts of that county for public-houses taken away scores of miles away, and no benefit whatever will accrue to them.

*MR. YOUNGER said that was perfectly true, and he admitted there were cases in which no benefits would arise, but they narrowed it very much when they confined it to a locality. When they made it national there would be very harsh cases in which people would have to pay very heavy levies without a single house being closed within miles of them. It was impossible to avoid cases of hardship now, but they were, of course, much more unlikely to be so acute, and advantages did arise. But it was not so here. They had that disability, therefore, as well as the other. If Clause 10 had been drawn in a more fair and reasonable and generous spirit, and if it had dealt with the situation more on the lines of the 1904 Act, which was working very well, it would, at all events on this particular point of machinery, have minimised very much the serious opposition which they were obliged to offer to the clause.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said the difficulties and complexities of this clause seemed almost to be greater than ever. It was a very difficult thing to arrive at the real value of a public-house. He did not think Schedule A was at all a satisfactory way of arriving at it, and neither was the rateable value. The only real way, to his mind, was to see what was the actual trade done in the house. He wondered it had never struck the Government to impose a licence duty based upon the actual trade of the house, which would have carried out all the objects aimed at in the Bill with infinitely less friction, worry, and trouble. There were a great many small houses which were kept alive simply for the purpose of compensation, or rather for the purpose of a transfer of licence. If they had a reasonable licence duty it would have the effect of closing down these houses, and then there would not be any compensation to be paid at all. That would get rid of all their difficulties, and it would arrive at the monopoly value—a small duty based on actual sales, getting higher and higher as the years went on, so that at the end of a certain period, they would acquire the whole of the monopoly value. The Government would have saved a great deal of trouble and time in discussing these exceedingly difficult and, to the ordinary layman, almost incomprehensible questions. He hoped, if any accident happened to the Bill, that in future legislation on this subject the Government would seriously apply their minds, not to these complicated questions of periods of reduction and taking the monopoly value by these ways which were entirely unsatisfactory, but to the adoption of the simple plan of gradually increasing licence duties, and they would arrive at exactly the same results as if the Bill became law.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) associated himself with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down in at least one particular. He had suggested to the Government that if the Bill should fail they would have brought home to them very strongly the lesson that logic was not a bad thing even on the part of a Cabinet Minister. He was not associating himself with the idea that high licence duties might solve the question, but the idea was a perfectly logical one. At any rate, if they had that question before them it would be a straight, fair fight which everyone could understand. He did not pretend to understand all the intricacies of the Licensing Bill. He had not tried to understand them. There were experts enough in the House without the intrusion of the amateur. But they were obliged to consider these questions, because there was not a constituency but would be affected by the Bill. He had heard every speech that had been delivered from the benches opposite except two, but there was one difficulty which he had not heard surmounted. It was this. Why had Schedule A been taken as the basis for reckoning compensation; and, having been taken, would the results give fair compensation? They had in the Act of 1904 a perfectly clear statement of the intentions of the Government then in power, and that was to provide adequate compensation upon the basis of market value. The hon. Member for Appleby, and no doubt the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley, would say: "Yes, but you are entirely wrong in putting public-house property upon the basis of any other kind of property." If that was a fair interpretation of their views, did the owner of the property, whether a private owner or a brewer, buy it as he would buy other property or not? He thought he did. He said to himself: "With good conduct and with ordinary consideration for the management of my house my licence will be renewed from year to year," and he bought accordingly, expecting to have continuity in his property.

After the Act of 1904 the publican was justified in saying with regard to compensation: "At any rate if I am dispossessed now I shall have full market value for what I have been dispossessed of." If he was putting that point fairly, would the House go one step further? Why the Government had descended from the full market value to the depth represented by Schedule A he did not know. Schedule A, as he understood it from the speeches by hon. Members opposite, would not give the owner of a licence goodwill or the market value of his personal energy and all those other things which had gone to build up and make the business of value. The Secretary for the Home Department would probably tell the House that special compensation was provided for such a business; but that could not be sufficient, and the only just and fair basis would be what that property would bring in if offered for sale in the open market. The Government had discarded that consideration altogether, and he wondered if the Government had actually realised how grave an injustice would be done to a great number of people who had honestly invested their money in these businesses. The Solicitor-General that afternoon, in regard to the extra three years which had been spoken of several times, had said it was not intended to represent any right whatever; it was simply a gift, a bonus that the Government in a fit of generosity had given. They did not allow compensation on the basis of twenty-one years. The Solicitor-General had added three years, which made sixteen years altogether, and he said the additional three years was a gift. But what did the acute and careful Under-Secretary of State say on this point? Speaking on 23rd October last, he said—

> "that no licence would be taken away after the fourteen years, but during the fourteenth year a man would get some compensation in respect of what he lost. He would get not merely his monopoly value for one year, but the prospect of seven years free from monopoly charge. It was only just and equitable that he should receive a sum in respect of that."

That was not at all. The Under-Secretary for the Home Office said that for these seven years there would be some compensation, but the Solicitor-General did not agree with him, for he said something which was quite the opposite.

SIR S. EVANS: I do not at all disagree with my right hon. friend. What I argued was that we should be perfectly right in saying that as the reduction period was fourteen years a licence taken away during that period would be properly taken away by the authority of Parliament, and we should have been within our right in saying that no extension should be made in the period for which the annuity was calculated in respect of the licence so taken away. I said at the time, and I indicated it, that inasmuch as there might be an expectation in some of those houses the licences of which were taken away within the fourteen years, they might reasonably ask for a portion of the seven years.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was much obliged for the explanation, but the situation as far as he understood it remained the same. The Solicitor-General did not agree that any compensation at all should be reckoned for those seven years, but the Under-Secretary for the Home Office held the opposite view. Under the Act of 1904 they had two forms of compensation carried out. First of all, there was the estimate by the Commissioners of twenty-five years purchase. That was considered fair, being based upon Schedule A. The Kennedy judgment carried things much further, because it said: "No, that is not equitable; we must have the market value." The Government had thrown aside the original estimate made upon Schedule A, and they had thrown aside also the Kennedy judgment. He wondered if hon. Members opposite were really satisfied in their own minds that what was now being offered was equitable. He did not believe that hon. Members opposite, with the exception of those few who were deadly opposed to the licensed trade, would willingly say that every licensed victualler and brewer should be cut off without any compensation at all. He knew hon. Members on the Ministerial side were obliged to support the Government. Inadequate compensation he considered to be a very deep wrong. Values once accumulated represented energy of some kind or other which had crystallised into a commodity that was saleable, and every public-house business which had been built up in that way had been built up legitimately. It might be that the business was bad, and that it was not a good thing to drink or to be drunk. It might be that the whole business was bad, but it had been built upon the basis of accumulated energy, and for any Bill to destroy energy would be striking at the very foundation and root of national enterprise. That was what he believed would occur when Clause 10 was put into operation if ever this Bill became law. Parliament was a High Court and he regretted extremely that it was so much permeated by party prejudices. When they came to a great financial measure such as this—for it was more largely a financial measure than anything else—he regretted to see that prejudice existed regarding the brewing trade, which was represented by vast numbers of people who were not themselves brewers but had taken stock in businesses absolutely legitimate and entirely respectable. It did not speak well for a free deliberative Assembly such as the House of Commons that, when they came to deal with something which in its essence was financial, they could not at the same time give the gravest consideration to those who were going to be dispossessed of their property. The Under-Secretary would perhaps explain to the House why it was that the Government said when dealing with a publican's property for probate: "We will have the market value to the last penny," but when it came to taking away from those people who inherited property then the Government said: "We will value this upon an entirely lower scale." They had not had during the afternoon a single statement from any responsible person on the Treasury bench or anybody behind them showing that the value to be given under Clause 10 would in any way nearly approach the market value. The hon. Member for Huddersfield made a very able speech and a very severe criticism upon this Bill, which he said was most inequitable. He pointed out that under the Schedule of the Bill the London publican would pay 9·7 per cent. levy; in a city of 500,000 people the publican would have to pay 12 per cent., and in small urban districts he would have to pay on the rateable value 16 per cent. He saw financial experts sitting opposite and on the front bench, and he would like to ask them were they going to leave that kind of levy and imposition upon the trade as a whole? Was it fair, just, or usual? Would the Government explain why, as the hon. Member for Sleaford and the hon. Member for Kidderminster had already asked, they would not allow the trade adequately to compensate themselves? One would think from the attitude of Ministers in these debates that they, as trustees for the people of the country, were safeguarding their financial interests by diminishing the compensation to be paid to those who were to be dispossessed of property. Whatever the property was—whether it represented goodwill, or monopoly value, or bricks and mortar—it still was property, and he could not understand why the Government had not gone on a broader basis. Hon. Members opposite would acknowledge that the basis on which compensation was to be reckoned was extraordinarily narrow. In ordinary circumstances when property was taken away for public purposes the broadest view was taken of the situation. It had been pointed out that when the London County Council took property in the Strand for public purposes they gave the men who were dispossessed the market value with 10 per cent. added. No one could estimate really the amount that ought to be paid for disturbance in connection with any business. A man who went into possession of a public-house brought what was called custom, and that was a great factor, and in respect of it he deserved great consideration. In all private affairs and dealings human justice said that when compensation for disturbance was being assessed the person disturbed should get something over and above the market value. The Government had not allowed anything whatever for disturbance.

Mr. G. D. FABER: They have taken off 50 per cent.

Sir GILBERT PARKER said he did not know that, but if they had taken off 50 per cent., they had taken off a great deal of the value and given nothing whatever in exchange. It seemed as if the Government had a fixed idea to give as little as possible, or rather to permit other people to tax themselves as little as possible. He honestly thought, speaking without any party prejudice, that in dealing with the finance of this Bill the Government had been querulous, grudging, lacking in vision, and lacking also in ordinary human sympathy. [AN HON. MEMBER: Justice.] He was not considering the question of justice under this Bill; he did not want to be disagreeable; but he had not seen from beginning to end in the action of the Government any thing like the element of justice.

SIR S. EVANS: Does the hon. Gentleman wish an increase in the compensation levy?

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was urging that the basis of compensation should be different—a basis by which the proper value should be given to the men whose property was to be taken away. The basis of compensation laid down by the Government was inadequate. He believed the basis of the clause was wrong. He wished to say a word about the tenant or licence-holder. The Government were deeply concerned to injure the brewer. The Prime Minister said in his Second Reading speech that the brewer was the possessor of inflated values which he himself had inflated. The inference was that the Government were determined to pay the brewer out, and to break the bubble of inflation, but by injuring the brewer they injured everybody else interested in the brewery business. He was not an advocate for the brewer or anybody else in this matter. He was an advocate for general justice and fair play. The Government said that under this Bill the licence-holder would have a much better time than under the Act of 1904. The compensation to be given to the licence-holder for loss of business was a second thought on the part of the Government. They did not agree to give it until they were pressed from every side of the House. Finding that the tide was running strongly against them, they realised the difficulties of the position, and they tried to do something for the licence-holder by compensating him to a very limited extent. If, as had been argued on both sides of the House, the compensation was, in many cases, a fifth of what it ought to be, then the licence-holder's share of the compensation would be exceedingly small.

SIR S. EVANS: It is an addition to the compensation given under the Act of 1904. The compensation is fixed for those interested in the property, and over and above that compensation is given to the licence-holder.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said the licence-holder would get compensation for the loss of business if the licence was extinguished, but if he was not dispossessed he would enter upon the seven years period which was to be added, subject to all the restrictions which the Bill imposed. There would be 60,000 of these houses, and they would be subject to local veto, constant supervision, and the increased vigilance of the licensing benches. He assumed that the licensing justices would grow more and more temperate. He did not complain of the growth of temperance, but, at the same time, he hoped that if restrictions were to be put on with respect to the sale of intoxicants justice would be done to those who were engaged in the trade. It was a poor prospect to hold out to the licensed holder that when the fourteen years were out he might have a period of genial quiet subject to yearly and daily restrictions which might be put upon him by any fanatics who might happen to be on the licensing bench. During the seven years no protection whatever was given to licence-holders. The Government would find, whatever approval their so-called high moral purposes might win from their supporters in the House, that a vast number of people outside would take the view that they had not been just or fair, and that this clause alone represented an element of cruelty and inconsiderateness which one would not expect from an enlightened administration.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) said he preferred the hon. Member for Gravesend as an expert on the taxation of the raw material of the brewing industry rather than as an expert on the finance of the brewing trade. The hon. Member said he was an advocate for neither the brewers nor anybody else. If that was so, why did he advocate a tax on the raw material of the brewing trade ?

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I never did so.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS said his memory might be at fault, but he understood that the hon. Member advocated the taxation of hops.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Never.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS said it might go forth now that the hon. Member for Gravesend was not in favour of the taxation of hops. Indulging in a cheap sneer, the hon. Member said it was a mistake to look into this Bill for justice. He was not sure that he did not agree with the hon. Member, for it would be found that the Bill was extremely generous to the whole of the brewing and the licensed trade. Was he to understand the hon. Member to lay it down as a principle that whenever a property was taken from an individual in the interests of the community that individual should receive full market value for his property ? If so, that principle had not always been carried out by the party of which the hon. Member was so distinguished an ornament. In the Housing of the Working Classes Act it was laid down that when slum property was acquired for public improvements, the owner should be deprived of compensation if he allowed illegal overcrowding in that property. He thought that there should be some exceptions to the hon. Member's rule that the public should pay full market value for property taken over for public purposes. So he also said that in the case of illegal adulteration of beer which had gone to swell the profits—[Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Name."]—there should be a deduction from the full market value of the house. The representatives of the brewing trade had not suggested until in recent debates that compensation should be paid for suppressed houses on the basis of full market value. The brewing representatives on the Royal Commission on licensing in dealing with the question of compensation expressly excluded from their proposed compensation the case of a certain artificial value due to what was called the surrender system. This was what the Report said—

> "An artificial value has temporarily accrued to many low-class houses, owing to their suitability for surrender purposes. These are the very ones which would be the most likely to disappear under our proposals. It should, therefore, be made clear that in valuing them no account is to be taken of such past and temporary value, which will by that time have ceased to exist together with the system that gave rise to it."

That was taking a very large slice out of the market value of that particular type of house. The hon. Member for Gravesend had asked why should the Government have taken Schedule A as a basis for compensation. He submitted that there was one very good ground why they should do so, because it embodied the very essential principles which the representatives of the brewing trade on the Royal Commission themselves advocated as the basis on which compensation should be paid. In other words, the essence of the Schedule A proposal was that the owner himself should declare the value for the purpose of taxation, and that that value should be used as the basis of compensation. That was the very proposal of the representatives of the brewing interest in the Report of the Royal Commission; and he was rather surprised that it had been lost sight of throughout the discussions. Here was the paragraph in the Report—

> "We have come to the conclusion that, if compensation is to be paid, it must be raised from the trade itself. We now proceed to describe the machinery by which we propose to ascertain the true and fair value of all licensed houses, whether for the purpose of suppression, or taxation for the provision of a compensation fund. Several of the proposed Bills explained to us contained a provision for a declaratory value by the licensee, which might be taken as a basis for compensation if suppressed, or taxation if it survive, thus compelling the owner of a licence to consider either contingency. This principle we adopt."

He submitted that if an excessive value was declared, in expectation of getting compensation for the house to be suppressed, it should be taxed on that basis; but on the other hand, if, anticipating that the house might not be suppressed, a fraudulent return as to the value of the property was made, then that should be taken as the value of the property for compensation purposes. The hon. Member for Gravesend and several other speakers had suggested with regard to the licensee that the basis upon which compensation might very well be considered should have some reference to the personal energy, or what he would call the custom-bringing value of the licence-holder. This custom-bringing value was to be compensated under this clause. He presumed the hon. Member did not suggest that personal energy was an attribute of the brewers.

MR. GRETTON: Why not?

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that at any rate it was true that in that debate they had manifested a great deal of energy. The custom-bringing energy was an attribute of the tenant and not of the brewer or owner, and, therefore, it was right that he should be compensated upon the basis of the value of the house and loss of business to him if the licence was suppressed. That was what the Bill proposed. An hon. Member had suggested that a tenant under this Bill, should it become law, would not be compensated on any more liberal a scale than he would have been under the Act of 1904. That statement he entirely denounced. He had taken cases in different parts of the country where compensation had been paid to specific individuals when the licence was suppressed and had compared it with what they would be entitled to under the provision of Clause 10. Here was a case from his own constituency. A man received the sum of £25 as compensation, which represented the annual rental value of his place. If he had been compensated on the basis of the provisions of this clause, he would have received the sum of £280. In another case, a tied tenant was compensated on the basis of annual rental £34, whereas the net value of the business to him was £370, which sum he would have obtained at the very minimum under the provisions of this clause. Another tied tenant three months ago received £57 compensation, whereas the net value of his business for one year was £400, and that sum he would have received under the provisions of this clause. He would particularly remind the hon. Baronet that the compensation fixed here was a minimum compensation, and that it was within the discretion of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to expand that sum to any sum which they might deem reasonable.

MR. GRETTON: Will the hon. Gentleman explain in what way this Bill makes his position better than it is under the Act of 1904?

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said he was rather glad that the hon. Gentleman had put his interruption in the form of an interrogative instead of in the form of a statement that what he had said with regard to the value of tied and free houses was untrue. In his view the advantage of this Bill in regard to compensation to the tenant as compared with the provisions of the Act of 1904 lay in this one very short point, that in the first place under the Act of 1904 a lump sum compensation was fixed upon the real property value of the place, plus the licensed value, and then out of that lump sum, the tenant, the licensee, got his share regulated by the annual rent that he paid, and the compensation was therefore fixed in definite relation to the amount of rent paid, whereas under this Bill the compensation was fixed in definite relation to the loss which he would suffer from the whole business as a tenant.

MR. GRETTON asked if the hon. Gentleman would read the words of the Bill.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said he would do so. The Bill said—

> "As compensation for the licence-holder's loss of business, or, where the licence-holder is managing the business on behalf of some other person, for the licence-holder's loss of employment, having regard to his conduct and the length of time during which he has been the holder of the licence not in any case being less than the amount of one year's net profits, to be determined in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Acts relating to income-tax."

In other words, while under the Act of 1904 the compensation to the tenant was fixed in definite relation to the amount of rent paid, under this Act it was fixed in definite relation to the net profits of the business.

Mr. GRETTON asked if the hon. Gentleman would refer to the words of the Act.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS said the Act of 1904 provided that in the case of the licence-holder, regard should be had not only to his legal interest in the premises or trade fixtures, but also to his conduct and the length of time that he had been the holder of the licence, and it was provided that the tenant should in no case receive a less amount than he would be entitled to as tenant from year to year of the licensed premises. He did not want to detain the House at any length, but to summarise what he was saying he would point out that it was perfectly clear, perfectly notorious, that the net profits of the business were very much in excess of the sum paid by way of rental by the tenant, and when they took the case of the tied tenant it was notorious that the rent was fixed low by design, so as to keep the rates down on the one side, and the amount of compensation levy payable on the other. The disparity between the rent paid and the net profits of the tenant was, therefore, still greater. The tenant under this Bill would get a sum which was above and beyond what the tenant could have got under the Act of 1904, by a sum which represented the difference between the annual rent paid and the total value of the net profit of that business to him. In a great many of the houses it was well-known that the licensees were not tenants at all. Under the Act of 1904 the manager did not get any compensation, but by the express provision of this clause the manager was to receive compensation which would be represented by one year of the value of the employment to him, so that where a man had received a salary of £3 a week, with coal and gas and certain service, he would be entitled to one year's full value of that salary, plus the cash value of the emoluments as compared with absolutely *nil* which he would get under the Act of 1904.

*Mr. GRETTON said he was sorry to interrupt the hon. Member, but the clause was only applicable to the manager who was also a licence-holder. The licence-holder and the manager got compensation under the Act of 1904, as the hon. Member would see if he looked at the Home Office Rules for the guidance of compensation authorities.

Mr. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that one's own experience was worth a deal more than any matter of that kind. He challenged the hon. Member for Rutland to cite any case in which the manager as licensee had received compensation under the Act of 1904. In these cases he carefully guarded himself by saying that in many cases the licensee was manager. He did not say, where they had a case of a manager who was not a licensee, he would get compensation. There was no provision of that kind, but where he was a licensee and manager he was entitled to compensation under this Bill, and he was not entitled to it under the Act of 1904.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said the hon. Member who had just sat down in the course of his exceedingly interesting and amusing speech had stated that the principle of this particular clause was the principle of "tax and take." He did not know that that was quite the English way of expressing it, but it evidently met with a good deal of support from the benches on the other side of the House, and he thought it really was true that they were face to face that evening with this particular clause, which might very well be described in the words of the hon. Member, as being a measure to tax all the unfortunate licensed victuallers in the country, and when they had all been taxed and the Government had got all they could out of them, they were to finish them off by taking all their property from them. Therefore it might be described very properly as a Bill to "tax and take." He thought that all of them who had seen and measured this piece of gross injustice might be grateful to the hon. Member for having furnished them in his speech with an observation which was uncommonly apt and correct. A good deal of misapprehension seemed to have been created in the mind of the hon. Member as to what was the precise subject matter of this section. He took it that if a licence was suppressed, if property was put an end to as a licensed house at some time during this period of fourteen years what was taken away was the goodwill of a business attached to and carried on upon these premises. The premises themselves were not taken away, but the goodwill of the business that was being carried on at the moment in them was the thing which was being put an end to. Speaking with some experience he could say that at all events in the neighbourhood that he was acquainted with, namely, Liverpool, there were a large number of licensed houses which owed a very considerable amount of their present high value to having come into the hands of brewers of means, position, ability, and honesty—men who had taken the trouble to make these houses all that they ought to be, in point of structural and sanitary accommodation, and to see that all the articles supplied in the houses were of the highest possible quality, and by the most constant supervision to ensure that the business should be carried on in a first class manner in those houses. The consequence was that a large number of those houses owned and carried on as he had described, had obtained a value quite different from the value which they previously possessed, and that particular value and goodwill was not incident to the premises as premises, or to the ordinary carrying on of a licensed house. It had been brought about by the express conduct of the brewer who owned the house. The hon. Member who had just sat down had asked in a scoffing tone, as though there could only be one answer to the question—

> "Is there a case where the brewer has ever done anything to add to the goodwill of the house?"

He could give a number of cases. He knew of seventy or eighty licensed houses where a very considerable portion of the special goodwill which those houses had got, had arisen from the fact that they were owned and carried on in the way that he had described. The hon. Member had told the House that the Report of the Royal Commission recommended Schedule A—the income-tax assessment—as the basis of compensation. He was astonished at that statement——

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS: I did not say that the Report of the Royal Commission recommended Schedule A as the basis. What I did say was that the principle of declaratory value which they recommended was the essence of the Schedule A method.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that when he referred to the Report of the Royal Commission he found this—

> "We further regard rateable value as altogether outside the mark as a basis for compensation, and it cannot according to our scheme be entertained as a basis of the taxation to which the compensation fund might be brought."

He failed to recognise the Report of the Commission quoted by the hon. Member.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS asked the hon. Member to read what the Report said specifically as to the income-tax basis further on. It said this—

> "There were two objections to this, first that it would be a somewhat inquisitorial process; and, secondly, that it would not take into account the interest of the owner of the property which was recognised by the law and the Income-Tax Commissioners."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the hon. Member and himself read Acts, Bills, Reports, etc., and brought the best intelligence they could to bear upon them, and being two people, naturally came to two different conclusions. Let him give an illustration as to how this clause would work. Supposing the assessment of a licensed house were £100 a year, and supposing in the case which he had before his mind at the moment, if that licence were taken away the piece of property would in all probability be assessed in Schedule A at £50 a year, it was obvious that the difference there for the purpose of subsection (2) of this section would be £50 a year; and supposing they were in the tenth year of the period when this particular licence was to be put an end to, according to the way the Bill was expressed £50 a year would be given for five years. He supposed that this would be a sum of £200; £200 would be paid as compensation for taking away the business, and in this case, which was not an imaginary one, supposing the licence was put an end to, what would be the position? This was a managed house. The manager would get £500, whilst the man who owned the business and who had been paying to the compensation fund for ten years would get only £200. Why? He did not know whether the Government had considered what would be the astonishing effect to the servants towards the close of the reduction period—the giving of the whole of the profit to the servants who were subject to a month's notice. He did not want to cut down anybody's compensation. If the State were going to compensate the man he would have nothing to say, but when the Government proposed a provision under which a man who was a servant and, in all probability, had done little or nothing to build up the business, was to receive the whole of the profit, he asked himself on what principle the Government were proceeding. The answer was obvious. The man had got a vote. He supposed the idea was that if the Government could get hold of the funds contributed, and then, by some subterfuge such as this clause, only pay out about a half, or something less, of the moneys to which they were reasonably entitled, on the basis on which they had contributed, at some future day they might appropriate the balance, and take it over themselves. He had not been able to read the Act of 1904 otherwise than from the basis of market value; this was the first time in his experience that the State had proposed that anybody's business should be taken from them when it was a legitimate business, and that they should receive practically no compensation for it. The remark made by the last speaker as to adulteration by brewers ought not to have been made. He was not interested in the trade, but to make a remark like that in the House of Commons against a business which had been carried on —taking it all round—under very great difficulties by respectable men, who had a legitimate trade, and to cast a reflection upon the whole trade, was not the right way to treat the House of Commons.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.) said the more one listened to the legal arguments on either side in regard to this question the more one became mystified, and therefore he could only rely upon his common sense and knowledge of business. He only rose to say that if the Government would come to Nottingham and offer compensation to the tea trade there in the way they proposed to give it to the licensed trade it would be accepted, and a good profit would be made. The Government could afford to be generous in the matter. It was more than a question of finance; it was a question of the lives and the homes of the people. He hoped the Bill would pass. If it were not no Bill would be passed and no Government would tackle this matter again for twenty years. The people of the country were looking to this Bill to remove a very great stumbling block in the way of social reform.

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. Deputy-Speaker proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'the,' in page 7, line 13, stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 287; Noes, 96. (Division List No. 390.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. D.

Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Terens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murray, Capt. Hn A C. (Kincard)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.

Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarhten, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Philip Arthur
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
Willioughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER then proceeded to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 15, after the word 'for,' to insert the words 'a number of years being the number of.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 16, after the word 'period, to insert the words 'with three years added thereto in each case, and.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 293; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 39[illegible].)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt)
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major J.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')

Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, SirWilliam Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,SirCharlesEdw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,RtHn.E.(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh)
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc)
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness,Hon.R.(Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S.Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardie,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,JamesFitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Miles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker,Col.W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbred, Howard
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt.Hon. C. B. Stuart.
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES
Alexander Acland-Hoo
Viscount Valentia.

Amendments proposed—

In page 7, line 18, to leave out the words 'with the addition of,' and to insert the word 'and.'"

"In page 7, line 19, to leave out the word 'add,' and to insert the word 'allow.'"

"In page 7, line 23, after the word 'regard,' to insert the words 'in each case.'"

"In page 7, line 25, after the word 'licence,' to insert the word 'but.'"

"In page 8, line 1, to leave out the words 'shall be,' and to insert the word 'is.'"

"In page 8, line 13, to leave out the word 'additional.'"

"In page 8, line 13, after the word 'sums,' to insert the word 'payable.'"

"In page 8, line 22, to leave out the word 'additional.'"

"In page 8, line 22, after the word 'sums,' to insert the word 'payable.'"

"In page 10, line 12, at end, to insert the words, 'Provided that for the purposes of this provision statutory reduction does not include further reduction.'"

"In page 11, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words '(which provides for appeals in the case of the refusal to renew or transfer a licence).'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 11, line 36, after the word 'exercise,' to insert the word 'all.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 300, Noes, 95. (Division List No. 392.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.Hn.Sir J.T.(Chesh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats,Sir T. (Renfrew,W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George

Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement

Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, lines 36 to 38, to leave out the words 'to the renewal and transfer of licences under the Licensing Acts, 1828 to 1906, and this Act,' and to insert the words 'licensing justices except their powers as to the confirmation of new licences.'"

"In page 12, line 26, at end, to insert the words 'In the absence from any cause of the chairman of the Court from any meeting of the Court, the members of the Court present shall choose one of their number to act as chairman.'"

"In page 12, line 33, at end, to insert the words '(6) The licensing appeal authority may make rules as to the costs to be incurred in any proceedings for confirmation of new licences, and as to the person by whom those costs are to be paid.'"

"In page 12, line 40, after the word 'last,' to insert the word 'published.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [BY ORDER].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That the Bill be now read a second time."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport) said the Order Paper showed that different views were taken on this measure by many Scottish Members, and perhaps it would be convenient if he made an explanation in justification of the Motion he should make that the debate should be adjourned. From representations made to the Board of Trade they had been able to glean what was the important ground of complaint in connection with the Bill. It arose in connection with the dislocation of the mail service from Aberdeen to London occasioned by some change in the departure time of mail trains. The effect, according to the representations made to the Board of Trade, was that the country north of Aberdeen had lost the mail connection which it had enjoyed without interruption for a considerable period of years. He was so much impressed by the seriousness of the matter that he had felt it his duty to put himself in communication with the North British Railway Company. He had had the opportunity of discussing the matter that day with the chairman and some of his colleagues, and he had suggested that in the interests of a possible settlement it would be advisable that the Second Reading of the Bill should be postponed till a later date. The reason of the postponement was this: The North British Railway Company had agreed to a responsible suggestion he made to them that there should be a conference between the various interests next Monday. They had consented to attend the conference and they were in process of consulting the various interests that might be deemed to have a voice in the matter. Of course when he used the word interest he included in the invitation Members of Parliament who were directly responsible to their constituents for seeing that the question was solved as far as possible in a peaceful manner. It would be altogether contrary to the interests of the Bill itself were they to take the Second Reading, and then endeavour to adjust matters by conference afterwards. He had thrown out the suggestion, which he was very glad to acknowledge had been accepted in a kindly spirit by the North British Railway Directorate, that the Second Reading should be deferred until the conference had taken place. He was hopeful that it would lead to an adjustment of this very serious question.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir H. Kearley.*)

Mr. YOUNGER thought that on the whole the hon. Gentleman had taken a wise course in the interests of the Bill in moving the adjournment. He was not himself concerned in the matter to which the hon. Gentleman had specially alluded, but he had on the Notice Paper an Amendment dealing with Clause 26 of the Bill, and he thought it extremely unfortunate that the agreed-on date should once again be postponed when counsel and solicitors and all the rest of the usual hangers-on had been brought to London and now had to go back in entire uncertainty as to when the Bill would be brought forward. He did not think he would be present next week to move the Amendment of which he had given notice. His object in rising was to ask that those who were interested in that particular question should in some way be consulted as to the fixing of the date.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) quite agreed that the question of the delivery of the mails ought to be settled before they let the Bill have a Second Reading. But there were other matters which they wanted to consider, and he did not want anybody to forget the question of the provision of third-class sleepers.

Mr. KEIR-HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) hoped the hon. Baronet would consider whether the rights of the employees of this company might not be considered at the same time. He had brought before the House at Question time a case where six of the employees had been compelled under a threat of dismissal to withdraw from a public body to which they had been duly elected. That seemed to him a very serious matter, and he was sure in all quarters of the House there would be a desire that that condition of things should not be allowed to continue. The interests affected by the Bill were all matters which might be considered and adjusted on Monday, but unless some action was taken to consult and safeguard the interests of the employees their opposition to the Bill would still be continued. He hoped the hon. Baronet when convening the conference would consider whether the employees could not be represented so as to put their case before the Board of Trade.

Sir H. KEARLEY said that the conference had been summoned to deal with the mail question, and there would be an opportunity on the Second Reading to raise any other point. If the hon. Member would place himself in communication with him he would be very happy to embrace the opportunity of putting his case before the directors when they were in London.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday, 30th November, at a quarter past Eight of the Clock.

CONSTABULARY (IRELAND) [PAY, ETC.].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, "That it is expedient to make further provision for the pay of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and for the pensions, pension allowances, and gratuities payable to them, their widows, and children."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 18th November, 1908.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.

Report from the Committee for Privileges that the Petitioner Albert Kirby Fairfax hath made out his claim to the peerage title, dignity, and honour of Baron Fairfax of Cameron in the Peerage of Scotland; made, and agreed to; and resolved and adjudged accordingly; and Resolution and Judgment to be laid before His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves, and to be transmitted to the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland: Ordered that all deeds, documents, and papers produced on behalf of the Petitioner by his agent, be delivered to the said agent.

FAIRFAX PEERAGE.

The evidence taken before the Committee for Privileges to be printed.

BARON KILMAINE.

Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Tuesday last, that the right of the Baron Kilmaine to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.)—

E. Cromer (chairman),
L. Colchester,
L. Monk Bretton,
L. Blyth,
L. MacDonnell;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES.

No. 29. (1908). Protocol between the United Kingdom, the Independent State of the Congo, France, Germany, Portugal, and Spain, prohibiting the importation of fire-arms, ammunition, etc., within a certain zone in Western Equatorial Africa; signed at Brussels, 2nd July, 1908.

No. 30. (1908). Accession of Liberia to the International Copyright Convention of 9th September, 1886, and the Additional Act and Declaration of 4th May, 1896. (16th October, 1908.)

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 586. Somaliland Protectorate (Report for 1907–1908).

No. 587. Trinidad and Tobago (Report for 1907–1908).

No. 588. Sierra Leone (Report for 1907).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE.

Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post (Salonica—Constantinople) The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 25) Warrant, 1908, dated 26th October, 1908; Foreign and Colonial Post except Parcels. The Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1908, dated 16th October, 1908.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PRECEDENCE FOR BILLS.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH rose to move, "That Standing Order No. XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended, and that on and after Wednesday, the 2nd day of December next, for the remainder of the session, the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, perhaps I ought to commence the very few remarks that I shall make on the Motion which I have placed on the Paper with an apology for venturing to raise the subject at all. But I spoke privately, both to the noble Earl the Leader of the House and to the noble Marquess who leads the Opposition, on the subject at the close of the sitting of the House before the summer adjournment, and it has more than once been borne in upon my mind that it would probably be for the general convenience if at these periods of the session, when the House is obliged to undertake the consideration of a large number of Bills, precedence were given to Bills as opposed to Motions on all the four days of the week on which the House sits; and I thought the best way to raise a discussion upon the subject was to put down in a concrete form the Motion that would be necessary to accomplish the purpose.

Your Lordships know that, by the Standing Orders, on Tuesdays and Thursdays Bills take precedence of other matters of business, and that on the other days of the week—it used to be Mondays and Fridays when the House sat on Fridays instead of Wednesdays, but is now Mondays and Wednesdays—notices, whether of Bills or Questions or abstract Motions, take precedence in accordance with the priority with which they are placed on the Paper. I think it must be within the recollection of many of your Lordships that sometimes when the House has been generally anxious to get to the consideration of a Bill a Notice has been on the Paper, concerning, perhaps, a subject of considerable interest, but not always of the great interest which may be centring upon the particular Bill; and it is often convenient, when the House is in Committee upon an important Bill, that the Committee stage, if not finished on the one night, should be taken on the following day while matters are fresh in the minds of noble Lords. On such occasions, if the House wishes to get precedence for the Bill, a special Motion has to be made the night before, and it appears on the Paper on the day on which the discussion should take place. That has sometimes caused personal inconvenience to noble Lords, who on the faith of the Notice Paper, believe that the business appearing thereon the day before will be taken. Perhaps they may have come up from the country for the purpose of taking part in the discussion, and find themselves forestalled by a Motion of which they could have no notice. If my Motion is carried, such an inconvenience as that could not follow.

I have inserted in the Motion Wednesday, 2nd December, but there is no principle in that particular day; it may be Wednesday, 9th day of December, or any other day in the month; but it seemed to me wise to raise a discussion a few days before the day on which it was suggested that the rule should come into operation, so that noble Lords might have full notice of any change if change were to be made. I have no personal feeling in the matter. I have put the Motion down in the belief that it would be for the convenience of the House at any rate to consider it. If it is not generally accepted, probably the wise course will be to leave things as they are. I have no desire to press the matter unduly.

It may be said that this would work to the benefit of the Government more than anybody else. I do not think that is so. No doubt the Bills which come up at this period of the session with any hope of being passed into law are mainly Government Bills; but, after all, the subjects dealt with in those Bills are usually those which at this period of the session are likely to attract the largest number of your Lordships to the House and to cause the greatest amount of discussion. In conclusion, I have to say that my sole object is to endeavour to contribute to the general convenience of the House, and I can assure your Lordships that if the Motion is not generally accepted I shall be quite willing to withdraw it.

Moved, "That Standing Order No. XXI. be considered in order to its being suspended, and that on and after Wednesday, 2nd day of December next, for the remainder of the session the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I waited before rising to see if any other noble Lord was likely to speak, because, like the noble Lord who has introduced this suggestion, I was anxious to know the general feeling of the House on the subject. The noble Lord will bear me out when I say that this is no collusive action between him and His Majesty's Government; but, so far as we are concerned, we are perfectly willing to agree to the suggestion he has made. The House will remember that at an early period of this autumn session I did make an appeal to noble Lords who desired to raise debates on subjects of general interest unconnected with Bills to put down those notices at an early date. I think that appeal has been very fairly and considerately acceded to by noble Lords. We have coming on in the course of the next two or three days, one or two important discussions on matters of current interest not concerned with Bills. I should hope, therefore, that the object of this Amendment is not so immediately important, because probably the list of those general discussions may have been pretty well exhausted before the date which the noble Lord has suggested for his Motion coming into effect. But, of course, the matter really is one for the convenience of the House. If there are certain Government proposals, as there always are towards the end of a session in your Lordships' House, to which a certain degree of consideration has to be given and there are only a certain number of days before we desire to adjourn, it is quite clear that any discussion on a Motion of a purely academic character takes one day away from the days which might properly be allotted to Bills, and therefore may involve a somewhat longer session. The matter is, as I say, far more one for the House than for His Majesty's Government; but, so far as we are concerned, we shall naturally not put any obstacle in the way of the noble Lord.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, speaking for myself individually I object entirely to the days on which private Members of Your Lordships' House can raise discussions which they consider of importance being interfered with in the way proposed. The noble Earl stated that there were a great many important measures to come before your Lordships' House. I quite admit that. I do not think that we should be holding an autumn session unless for the purpose of disposing of important Bills carried forward from an earlier part of the session; but, at the same time, I think it is a somewhat autocratic proposal to take away those days which have always been regarded as the days when private Members were privileged to raise questions of public interest. I gave notice, at the commencement of the autumn session, of my intention to raise the question of the state of Ireland, and I did so. I consider the state of that country so serious at the present time that I should feel myself entitled to raise the question again at any moment; but, if the noble Lord's Motion were carried, the Government would be able to avoid the discussion of that matter merely by blocking my Motion by putting down for the same day, say, the Committee stage of some Bill. I therefore strongly object to private Members' days being taken away. I am sure the Government will experience no difficulty whatever in persuading noble Lords who have Questions on the Paper on days that may be required for Government Bills to postpone those Questions. But to take every single day away from private Members would be an act which I should be very sorry to see done, and one which would create a dangerous precedent.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, this is, as the noble Earl opposite truly said, a matter for the body of the House rather than for the two front benches; and I confess I was rather surprised when, after my noble friend Lord Balfour sat down, no Peer rose on either side from the back benches to raise his voice for or against the proposal. I agree with my noble friend in thinking that we do not infrequently arrive at a moment when it is necessary, in order that our business may be carried on in a continuous fashion, that some sacrifice of the private Member's rights should be asked for. On the other hand, I am bound to say that in cases of that kind, where a private Member has possession of a certain day and where that day is wanted for the continuation of the discussion of a really important Bill, there has hardly ever been found any difficulty in inducing that private Member to give way in order that the business may be carried on in accordance with the general convenience of the House. I ask myself whether we really have arrived at a moment when it is desirable to invite what I may call the rank and file of the House to make this sacrifice. Upon the whole I am inclined to come to the conclusion that we have not, and that there is no necessity yet for taking so heroic a step as my noble friend behind me proposes. The attendance of your Lordships to-night is not very numerous, and I have been made aware, from private sources, that there are a considerable number of Peers who take the view which my noble friend Lord Londonderry has expressed. I therefore would venture to suggest to my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh, who has explained to us very frankly that he desires to consult the convenience of the whole House, that it might be convenient that he should not press his Motion for the present, leaving the matter entirely open for further consideration at some future time.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, it is quite obvious, after the appeal made by the noble Marquess, that it would be idle to press the matter to a division at the present time. But I venture to hope that the raising of the discussion and the remarks of the noble Earl the Leader of the House and of the noble Marquess on this side will facilitate the withdrawal of abstract discussions at times when it really would be for the convenience of the House to go to the merits of particular Bills. With the leave of the House, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The Marquess of Lansdowne.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Bill read 3^a.

LORD DENMAN moved to amend Clause 5 (Creation and application of Irish Housing Fund) by inserting, after the word "ascertain," the words "and certify." He explained that the object of the Amendment was to oblige the Local Government Board to certify as well as to ascertain the amount annually charged for housing under the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 26, after the word 'ascertain,' to insert the words 'and certify.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

LORD DENMAN moved the insertion of a new subsection to Clause 6, providing that "The provisions of this section shall extend to Orders of the Local Government Board made after the passing of this Act upon petitions of local authorities presented before the passing of this Act." He said that by this clause the existing provisions of statutes dealing with Provisional Orders were virtually repealed. It might happen that a local authority had already instituted proceedings to obtain a Provisional Order, and that by the time the Bill came into force the Provisional Order might not actually have been made. In that case the local authority would find itself hung up, so to speak, inasmuch as it would be unable to take advantage of the provisions of the statutes repealed, and also unable to avail itself of the provisions of this Bill. The insertion of the subsection was to meet that particular case.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 37, after the word 'order,' to insert the following new subsection: '(6) The provisions of this section shall extend to Orders of the Local Government Board made after the passing of this Act upon petitions of local authorities presented before the passing of this Act.' "—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD DENMAN moved to amend Clause 11, which provided that—

> " For the purposes of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, Section 72 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, as amended by the Second Schedule to the Act of 1890, shall have effect as if 'one hundred pounds' were substituted therein for 'twenty pounds,' "

by inserting, before the words " Section 72," the words " Section 71 and."

Amendment moved—

> " In page 7, line 15, after the word 'Acts,' to insert the words 'Section 71 and.' "—(*Lord Denman.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE asked whether the Amendment which he proposed to move would not come before this one.

LORD DENMAN: No.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) pointed out that the noble and learned Lord had no Amendment on the Paper, and said he had no knowledge of any Amendments to be moved except those on the Paper. It would be convenient, if there were any Amendments not on the Paper, that they should be handed to him.

LORD ATKINSON thought Lord Denman had better also include in his Amendment Sections 69 and 70 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845. Under those sections, when the compensation exceeded £20 and did not exceed £200, certain things had to be done; when it did not exceed £20, that sum might be paid to the person in receipt of the rents and profits of the land for the time being and applied to his own purpose. Section 71 provided that when money paid into court exceeded £20, certain things were to be done. He took it that the object of the noble Lord in charge of the Bill was to substitute £100 for £20 in each of those sections, and to secure that when the sum did not exceed £100 the money might be paid over to the person entitled to the rents and profits of the lands in respect of which such money had been paid. The sections of the Act of 1845 would be made ridiculous if £100 was substituted for £20 in two sections only. The clause in the Bill provided that Section 72 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, should have effect as if £100 were substituted therein for £20; but, as a matter of fact, the words " twenty pounds " did not occur at all in Section 72. The three sections, therefore, which ought to be changed were Sections 69, 70, and 71, by substituting £100 for £20 in each case where the latter sum was mentioned.

LORD DENMAN thanked the noble and learned Lord for calling attention to this matter. He naturally bowed to the noble and learned Lord's opinion, and as it appeared necessary to mention the two previous sections of the Act of 1845 he would, with the leave of the House, alter his Amendment so as to insert " Sections 69, 70, 71, and."

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said Lord Atkinson had pointed out that the section mentioned in Clause 11 was erroneously mentioned, and that, instead of one, three sections should be mentioned. If that were so, there had been some blunder in the printing or some oversight, and he felt considerable difficulty as to how far this matter could be corrected at this stage, as the proposed Amendments were not upon the Paper. As he understood, his noble and learned friend had an Amendment designed to carry out the purpose which was common, he thought, to both sides of the House, but it was not on the Paper.

LORD ATKINSON said he had, on the Paper, an Amendment to the same clause to insert this proviso—

> " Provided that the sums paid under the provisions of Section 72 of the first-mentioned statute by any particular local authority in respect of any interest in land taken under any scheme or schemes to a person or persons not absolutely entitled to the interest purchased shall not exceed in the aggregate three hundred pounds."

It would be necessary, however, to change the section in this proviso in accordance with his previous observations.

LORD ASHBOURNE said he had not looked up the sections of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act himself, but had no doubt that his noble and learned friend Lord Atkinson had correctly indicated the way in which the sections ran. The Amendment which he (Lord Ashbourne) sought to insert in Clause 11, and which he had handed to the Lord Chancellor, was to substitute £60 for £100. Whether this could be done after Third Reading, the Amendments now being discussed not being on the Paper, was another matter. The House was extremely jealous on this point. Great freedom was allowed in Committee and a substantial amount of freedom on Report, but he believed it was the rule of the House that no Amendment not on the Paper should be moved after Third Reading. In these circumstances, would it not be better to let the matter stand over till another day, when the Amendments could be placed on the Paper and inserted in a regular form ?

LORD DENMAN expressed willingness to adopt the course which the noble and learned Lord had suggested.

Moved, "That the debate on the Amendment be adjourned."—(*Lord Denman*).

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR asked whether, the debate on the Amendment to Clause 11 having been adjourned, the House would take the other Amendment on the Paper in the name of Lord Donoughmore.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE was proceeding to move the insertion, after Clause 17, of a new clause providing that the Bill should not apply to any town, the population of which at the last census was less than 2,000, when——

*THE EARL OF CREWE : I am reluctant to interfere, but my impression is that the course which has been suggested is a very unusual one. I cannot recall any precedent for adjourning the consideration of a particular clause and immediately taking another. It is sometimes moved that a particular clause be taken last. I fancy that course might have been taken, but I have never known it done except in Committee.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Would not the simpler and more obvious course be to adjourn the discussion altogether ?

Further debate adjourned till Tomorrow.

COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871.

Order made yesterday for printing the application received from the University College of Bristol for the establishment of a University in Bristol, discharged.

House adjourned at Five o'clock,
till To-morrow, half-past Ten
o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 18*th November*, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Essex (Mid or Chelmsford Division), in the room of Major Sir Frederic Carne Rasch, Baronet (Manor of Northstead).—(*Mr. Henry Forster.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London and District Elecricity Supply Bill [Lords], reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition in favour—From Baltonsborough; and Mear; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SPECIAL EXCEPTION).

Meal Times.—Paper [presented 19th October] to be printed. [No. 325.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SPECIAL EXCEPTION).

Holidays.—Paper [presented 19th October] to be printed. [No. 326.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SPECIAL EXCEPTION).

Employment inside and outside on the same day.—Paper [presented 19th October] to be printed. [No. 327.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (SPECIAL EXCEPTION).

Overtime.—Paper [presented 19th October] to be printed. [No. 328.]

COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871.

Paper [presented 17th November] to be printed. [No. 329.]

UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN ACT, 1905.

Paper [presented 17th November] to be printed. [No. 330.]

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1908. Dated 16th October 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL) PARCEL POST.

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 25) Warrant, 1908. Dated 26th October 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL.)

Copies presented, of Colonial Reports, No. 586 (Somaliland Protectorate, Report for 1907–8): No. 587 (Trinidad and Tobago, Report for 1907–8); No. 588 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PATENTS AND DESIGNS ACT, 1907.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Board of Trade under Section 8 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations providing for Special Grants in aid of certain Local Education Authorities in England and Wales in 1908–9 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS, ETC. (PUPILS).

Return ordered, "showing the total number of pupils in the secondary schools and pupil-teacher centres mentioned in the list of recognised schools recently published [Cd. 4374], in the following form—

Secondary Schools.

Number of Pupils, excluding Pupil Teachers.									Intending Teachers.		
Boys.				Girls.				Total.	Bursars.		Pupil Teachers.
Under 12.	12–16.	Over 16.	Total.	Under 12.	12–16.	Over 16.	Total.		Boys.	Girls.	

Pupil-Teacher Centres.

Number of Pupil Teachers.									Pupils in Preparatory Classes.										
Boys.				Girls.				Total.	Registered Pupils.							Other Pupils.		
15 to 16.	Over 16.		Total.	15 to 16.	Over 16.		Total.		Boys.			Girls.			Total.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
	1st Year.	2nd Year.			1st Year.	2nd Year.			1st Year.	2nd Year.	Total.	1st Year.	2nd Year.	Total.				

—(*Mr. Illingworth.*)

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1907–8.

Copy ordered, "of Accounts of the Civil Contingencies Fund, 1907–8, showing (1) the receipts and payments in connection with the fund in the year ended the 31st day of March 1908; (2) the distribution of the capital of the fund at the commencement and close of the year, together with copy of the correspondence with the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon,"—(*Mr. Hobhouse.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Trying of Cromarty Police-Court Cases at Dingwall and Tain.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Lord Advocate if he will explain why certain fishermen residing at Cromarty were recently summoned to appear first at Dingwall and subsequently at Tain in connection with offences alleged to have been committed at Cromarty within a quarter of a mile of the court-house provided for the trying of local cases, especially bearing in mind that the Dingwall Sheriff attended at Cromarty and conducted business there only two days after the men were before the court at Dingwall; and, seeing that the trial at Dingwall or Tain of offences committed at Cromarty imposes heavy expenses on defendants as well as on witnesses, will instructions be given for such cases to be taken at the court-house at Cromarty in future.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) The Dingwall case was a private prosecution for poaching, and the fishermen referred to were convicted and fined. The offence to be tried at Tain is one of assault. I have made inquiries as to Tain and not Cromarty being selected as the place of trial, and I am informed that for several years cases of this character have been tried in Tain in consequence of disturbances which took place on the occasion of the last Cromarty trial. It is the opinion of the sheriff and of all the authorities locally concerned that the practice should be followed on the present occasion, and I cannot see my way to countermand the order given for trial there accordingly.

Old-Age Pension Regulations.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a person who spent a number of years in the United States, but who left his wife and family in Ireland, contributing in the meantime to their maintenance, and who has been for the past eight years back in his own country, is entitled to an old-age pension, all the other requirements of the Act being satisfied.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The matter is governed by Article 29 of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, to which I may refer the hon. Member.

Prosecution of William MacKinley for Reckless Navigation.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the case of a Clyde pilot, William MacKinlay, who was tried at Glasgow, on 15th May last, for reckless navigation of the steamship "Maracas" on 11th November preceding, whereby H.M.S. "Harrier" was alleged to have been endangered; if so, will he say why so long a time was allowed to elapse before this case was brought to trial, to the great disadvantage of the defendant; why his Department took four months to instruct the prosecuting authority in Scotland and another month to give them fuller particulars; and if in future, if a charge is to be instituted in Scotland, he will see that no such delay as this occurs.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) My attention has been called to the case. There does not appear to have been any avoidable delay. Much inter-departmental correspondence was necessary, as well as reference to the owners of the "Maracas" and the Clyde Pilot Board, before the matter could be placed in the hands of the legal authorities. For the intervening period until judgment was given by the sheriff at Glasgow the Admiralty cannot be held responsible.

Application for Small Holdings in West Suffolk.

MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in West Suffolk 254 applications have been made for small holdings and eighty-three of these have been approved, and that no applicants have yet been provided for by the council and no land acquired; and what steps he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Yes, Sir. The county council are however negotiating for the acquisition of several properties, and the Board have every reason to believe that the council will submit some schemes before long. If they fail to do so the Board will take all necessary steps in the matter.

Demonstration against the Tribes in the Tilul Basran.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received a communication from Khartoum stating that a force under Major Lempriere operating from Dilling, South Kordofan, made a demonstration against the tribes in the Tilul Basran district, and that the hill was stormed on 3rd November and the chiefs of the village captured, the Government casualties being three killed and twenty-four wounded, and the enemy's loss sixty; by whose authority was this punitive expedition undertaken; was the Foreign Office aware of its having been undertaken, and were these hostile proceedings commenced with the direct sanction of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, if so, will he be able to communicate the information on which he authorised the expedition; whether the loss of the enemy was the loss of sixty lives; how many were killed and how many wounded, and what became of the wounded or what treatment was accorded to them; and whether he will be able to give particulars of this expedition and the reasons for it, and to state whether it was accompanied with the burning of villages and the destruction of crops; and whether any further hostilities in the Soudan are contemplated by the Government.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Grey.*) I have received no official information with regard to these operations except that no casualties have occurred among the British officers engaged. It is, of course, within the competence of the Government of the Soudan to take, on their own initiative, any measures that may be necessary for protection and the maintenance of order.

Report of the Truck Committee.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Lord Advocate whether, having regard to the acceptance by the Government of the Resolution of the 27th February, 1906, he can now state when the Report of the Truck Committee, promised to be presented before Easter, and subsequently for this month, will be in the hands of Members; and if arrangements can be made to expedite the circulation of the evidence.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) The full draft of this Report has been prepared and is about to be circulated for consideration by the members of the Committee. It is still hoped that the Report, evidence, and other relative papers will be issued this month.

Treatment of Imprisoned Suffragists.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what was the method by which he drew the attention of a magistrate who had ordered the imprisonment of eleven ladies for offences arising out of the suffrage agitation, who were placed by his order in the third division, to the fact that these ladies belonged to the class of prisoners for whom the second division was intended, with the result that the magistrate removed these prisoners from the third to the second division; whether there is any, and, if so, what, other instance of a member of the Executive Government communicating with a magistrate; and whether he will explain his reasons for determining to advise the Crown, in the exercise of its prerogative, to order the transfer of these ladies from the third to the second division, instead of bringing pressure to bear on a magistrate to modify his sentences in accordance with the suggestions of the Executive.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I communicated with the chief magistrate, who drew the attention of the convicting magistrate to the fact that these prisoners belong to the class for whom the second division is intended. I frequently have occasion to communicate with magistrates throughout the country to remind them of the responsibility placed on them by Parliament for the choice of the divisions in which prisoners should be placed, and have done so both by Circular and in particular cases. As I have already explained, it would in my opinion be unconstitutional to use the prerogative of the Crown for the purpose of overriding, with regard to a whole class of cases, the discretion given to the Court by statute. I need hardly say that no pressure of any kind was brought to bear upon the magistrate in this case.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the fact that the Commissioner of Police in London is under his control and jurisdiction, he accepts responsibility for the institution of proceedings against ladies by the police authorities, in relation to matters arising out of the suffragist agitation, in which they have been summoned to police Courts to enter into recognisances to be of good behaviour with the alternative of imprisonment in default of entering into such recognisances into which it was publicly stated by them they would decline to enter, and that by this method these ladies have been sentenced to imprisonment in the second division which is not regarded at law as conviction of any offence with power of appeal to a higher tribunal; and whether these proceedings have his sanction; and, if so, on what grounds does he base their justification.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I accept full responsibility for the proceedings taken by the Metropolitan Police. The adoption of preventive measures for the preservation of order in the streets was, in my opinion, amply justified by the circumstances of the case.

Applications for Distress Committees Refused.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the names of the thirty-three local authorities who applied for permission to establish distress committees and were refused, giving the population within their areas, and also the names of the eleven authorities who applied and afterwards withdrew their application, giving the population in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The following tables give the information for which my hon. friend asks. Table A refers to the thirty-three local authorities and Table B to the eleven local authorities to whom he refers:—

Table A.

Local Authority.	Population (1901).
Bath T.C. - - - -	- 49,839
*Loughborough T.C. - -	- 21,508
Ealing T.C. - - - -	- 33,031
*Folkestone T.C. - -	- 30,379
Woking U.D.C. - -	- 18,349
Southend-on-Sea T.C. -	- 28,857
*Chiswick U.D.C. - -	- 29,809
Stoke-upon-Trent T.C. -	- 30,458
Exeter T.C. - - -	- 47,185
Aldershot U.D.C. - -	- 30,974
Chesterfield T.C. - -	- 27,185
Gray's Thurrock U.D.C. -	- 13,834
Wakefield T.C. - - -	- 41,413
Twickenham U.D.C. - -	- 20,991
Brentford U.D.C. - -	- 15,171
Barking Town U.D.C. -	- 21,547
Wellingborough U.D.C. -	- 18,412
Todmorden T.C. - -	- 25,418
*Brighouse T.C. - - -	- 21,735
Kingston-upon-Thames T.C.	- 34,375
Winchester T.C. - -	- 20,929
Dewsbury T.C. - - -	- 28,060
Harrogate T.C. - - -	- 28,423
Wood Green U.D.C. - -	- 34,233
Handsworth U.D.C. - -	- 13,404
Keighley T.C. - - -	- 41,564
Hartlepool T.C.- - -	- 22,723
Wimbledon T.C. - -	- 41,652
Eccles T.C. - - -	- 34,369
Portland U.D.C. - -	- 15,199
Finchley U.D.C. - -	- 22,126
Bingley U.D.C.- - -	- 18,449
Barry U.D.C. - - -	- 27,030

Note.—An application was also made in 1905 by the Southall Norwood Urban District Council. This was not assented to at that time. A further application from this urban district council in 1907 was not proceeded with. This case has been included among the applications abandoned. See Table B.

---

*Fresh application now under consideration.

Table B.

Local Authority.	Population (1901).
Gosport and Alverstoke U.D.C.	28,884
Gloucester T.C.	47,955
Darlington T.C.	44,511
Aberdare U.D.C.	43,365
Pontefract T.C.	13,427
Castleford U.D.C.	17,386
Crewe T.C.	42,074
Macclesfield T.C.	34,624
*Darwen T.C.	38,212
Llanelly U.D.C.	25,617
†Southall Norwood U.D.C.	13,200

I may add that since I replied to my hon. friend's Question of the 2nd November, I have agreed to the establishment of a distress committee at Barking Town, which is one of the places mentioned in Table A, and also in the following cases—

Local Authority.	Population (1901.)
Maidstone T.C.	33,516
Nelson T.C.	32,816
Swindon T.C	45,006
Hebburn U.D.C.	20,901
Hartlepool T.C.	22,723

I have also declined, on the information before me, to set up distress committees at the present time in the following cases—

Local Authority.	Population (1901.)
Oldbury U.D.C.	25,191
Willenhall U.D.C.	18,515
Leigh T.C.	40,001
Tunstall U.D.C.	24,709
Burslem T.C.	38,766

Note.—T.C. means Town Council, and U.D.C. Urban District Council.

Amending Regulation 25 of Old-Age Pensions.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state whether an Order in Council will be issued to amend No. 25 of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, and, if so, when.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) A draft Order in Council, annulling Article 25 of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations as from the 1st January, 1909, is being prepared, and will be laid before His Majesty in Council at an early opportunity.

Distress Committees—Applicants for Work—Reasons for Leaving.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can recommend, with a view to discovering the genuine unemployed, that a column should be added in the printed registers for applicants for work on distress committees showing what reason each man gives for leaving the work afforded by such committees.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The hon. Member will see from the regulations of 13th January, 1906, a copy of which I lately sent him, that the record paper prescribed by them contemplates the entry of a record of the after history of the case, and this entry would properly include such a matter as that referred to in the Question. It is open to a distress committee to enter in the register which they are required to keep, by Article VII. of the Regulations of 10th October, 1905, particulars under this head extracted from the record paper, but I doubt whether it is necessary for me to make any special recommendation on the subject.

Applications for Small Holdings.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will state the total number of applications that have been made for allotments under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act; the number of applicants approved as suitable; and the number of those whose applications have been satisfied.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) No detailed information has yet been obtained as to the demand for allotments. There are over 14,000 allotment authorities, and it would not be practicable to obtain Returns from them more often than once a year. The information will be obtained for the Annual Report.

Old-Age Pensions—Calculation of Means of Irish Farmers.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state on what basis are pension officers in Ireland to calculate the income of a small farm; whether by the rent paid, or if he can state what is to be the procedure in such cases.

---

* Fresh application now under consideration.

† See note at foot of Table A.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) As I informed the hon. Member for East Tyrone on the 10th inst., pension officers have to exercise their discretion in dealing with this class of case. The assessment of the advantage derived from the occupation of a holding is a matter of considerable difficulty, and, while the amount of the rent in many cases provides a useful working measure of such advantage, it has not been possible to lay down an invariable rule on that basis. Each case has to be considered upon its merits with reference to the amount of rent paid and to other considerations affecting the value of the holding to the occupier as a source of income and means of subsistence.

Irish Land Purchase Agreements.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in reference to subsection 3, Section 48 of the Land Purchase Act of 1903, all agreements lodged after 1st November, and prior to the publication of any revised Treasury rules will be treated on the same terms as those lodged before 1st November.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I must ask the hon. Member to await the introduction of the Irish Land Bill next week.

Naval Expenditure of Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will state what are the total aggregate amounts which have been devoted to naval expenditure during the last ten years by Great Britain, Germany, France, and Russia, respectively, and how far those amounts are affected by the expenditure mentioned in Appendix A in what is known as the Thomasson Return.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*)—

Great Britain.

Total Naval Expenditure during the last Ten Years.

Year.	Total Expenditure.	Appendix A.
	£	£
1899–1900	25,731,220	3,028,720
1900–1	29,998,529	3,052,127
1901–2	30,981,315	3,071,875
1902–3	31,003,977	3,180,044
1903–4	35,709,477	3,392,691
1904–5	36,859,681	3,674,880
1905–6	33,151,841	3,771,667
1906–7	31,472,087	3,488,853
1907–8 (estimated)	31,419,500	3,668,440
1908–9 (estimated)	32,319,500	3,679,000
Total	318,647,127	34,008,297
Less Appendix A	34,008,297	
Net total	284,638,830	

NOTE.—The aggregate shown is confined to that chargeable to Navy Votes, and does not include expenditure under the Naval Works Acts, 1895–1905.

Total Naval Expenditure during the last ten years of Germany, France, and Russia, respectively.

Year.	Germany.		France.			Russia.	
	Total Expenditure.	Appendix B.	Total Expenditure.	Appendix A.	Appendix B.	Total Expenditure.	Appendix B.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1899 - - - - - -	6,672,788	50,997	12,144,020	—	1,120,318	8,306,500	113,006
1900 - - - - - -	7,648,781	54,370	12,511,053	—	1,124,072	8,662,801	111,752
1901 - - - - - -	9,530,333	118,762	13,107,701	—	1,154,262	9,359,766	128,024
1902 - - - - - -	10,044,031	70,260	12,271,948	—	571,656	10,446,392	127,599
1903 - - - - - -	10,401,174	69,581	12,538,861	—	562,410	12,349,567	126,427
1904 - - - - - -	10,102,740	95,162	12,513,143	29,156	574,929	11,949,906	137,142
1905 - - - - - -	11,301,370	172,715	12,747,963	29,156	596,148	12,392,684	143,132
1906 - - - - - -	12,005,871	218,089	13,003,238	29,855	622,236	12,490,444	191,197
1907 - - - - - -	13,623,924	286,863	12,486,793	33,014	647,100	8,850,240	183,915
1908 - - - - - -	16,596,561	371,803	12,797,308	33,893	678,060	9,833,915	256,193
Totals - - -	107,927,573	1,508,602	126,122,028	155,074	7,651,191	104,642,215	1,518,387
Less Appendices -	1,508,602	—	7,806,265	—	—	1,518,387	—
Net Totals - -	106,418,971	—	118,315,763	—	—	103,123,828	—

NOTE.—The sums representing expenditure on items (as shown under Appendices A and B), which have no equivalents in the other Estimates, are deducted in order to make the totals comparable.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Devonport Dockyard.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the order posted up in His Majesty's dockyard, Devonport, viz., all men seeking entry must be out of employment at the time, preference to be given to men who have served in the yard before, but out of employment; and if he is aware that the officials at the dockyard have been entering men who were in employment at the time of entry; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The conditions set out on the notice to which the hon. Member refers, are in accordance with recent Admiralty instructions relative to these special entries of workmen in His Majesty's dockyards. Every care has been taken to exclude men already in employment, and so far as is known, none but men actually unemployed have been entered, except one joiner, who was under notice of discharge by his employer when he applied for work. One man who was in evening employment was also entered in ignorance of the fact, and directly it was discovered, he took his own discharge. Ten men who were skilled mechanics employed as labourers have been rated as mechanics, namely, eight smiths and two plumbers, and their places filled by men entered as labourers.

Cheap Ammunition for Rifle Clubs.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a decision has yet been reached as to the supply of cheap ammunition to rifle clubs; and whether he is aware of the steps which have been taken by the National Rifle Association to secure the same object.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The question of the supply of cheap ammunition to rifle clubs is still under consideration. The War Office is not aware of the steps taken by the National Rifle Association in this direction.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): Having regard to the fact that shooting in miniature rifle clubs is now commencing, will he accelerate, as far as possible, negotiations on the subject?

MR. HALDANE: Yes Sir.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): When may we hope for an Answer?

MR. HALDANE: I have already enunciated the general principles, and I am now working out the details.

Parkhurst Barracks Baths.

CAPTAIN CLIVE (Herefordshire, Ross): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many baths with hot and cold water are provided per 100 soldiers at Parkhurst Barracks, Isle of Wight.

MR. HALDANE: There are two baths for non-commissioned officers and eight for men giving approximately 2·22 per cent. for non-commissioned officers and 1 per cent for men.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the provision for soldiers in this respect is far worse than that in the adjoining convict prison?

MR. HALDANE: There is not the smallest analogy between the two cases. The soldiers are willing bathers. The arrangements were settled just before I came into office, and I am informed that they are in exact accordance with the regulations.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: Will the conditions be improved?

MR. HALDANE: I am not aware that that is required.

British Garrison in India.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): May I ask the Secretary of State for War a Question of which I have given him private notice—namely, if he will state whether, looking at the state of affairs in India, he will hold in abeyance the removal of any troops from South Africa to home, and whether it is his intention to despatch any reinforcements to India beyond ordinary drafts, or to keep time-expired men in India for the present.

MR. HALDANE: I received notice of the hon. Member's Question a couple of hours ago. I am certainly not aware of anything which necessitates the taking of any such steps as he suggests.

*CAPTAIN FABER: May I remind the right hon. Gentleman—[Cries of "Order."] May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will remember the fact that South Africa was saved by an Indian Brigade being there in time?

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Is it not a fact that owing to the nature of the armaments of the British troops they are now at least 400 per cent. stronger than an equal number were fifty years ago?

MR. HALDANE: I think that any discussion of this kind is very much to be deprecated.

Charitable Pensions and Old-Age Pensions.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether pension officers are authorised to reckon charitable pensions which are voluntary, and have not been a condition of the applicant's previous service, as part of his income disqualifying for a pension.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): Pension officers have been instructed to treat in their reports to the Pension Committee such sources of income as forming part of the means of the claimant for the purpose of the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Parkhurst Prison Baths.

CAPTAIN CLIVE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many baths with hot and cold water are provided per 100 prisoners at Parkhurst Prison, Isle of Wight.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The Answer is seven.

Pentonville Prisoner's Blunder.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can explain why a letter written on 29th October by William Williams, a prisoner in Pentonville Prison, was not delivered to his friends until 16th November; whether he is aware that as a consequence Williams' friends were kept in entire ignorance of his whereabouts and suffered much anxiety, whilst the Metropolitan Police force were searching for him all over London; and whether he proposes to take any action to punish those responsible for keeping back the letter, and will issue regulations to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

MR. GLADSTONE: The notice to the prisoner's friends was sent on the 29th of October to the address given by the prisoner, but it was returned on the 3rd of October marked "Address not known," and the prisoner was so informed. On November the 13th he applied to re-address the letter, and this was immediately done. The delay was due to the prisoner's mistake, and the prison officials are in no way responsible for it. The hon. Member has given me private notice of a further Question relating to the same case, and in reply to that, perhaps I may be allowed to say now that I am making inquiries into the matter.

Telegraph Messengers and Adult Duties.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state how many telegraph messengers of less than sixteen years of age it is proposed to employ on men's duties during the Christmas period in the Post Office; whether it is contrary to the regulations to employ boys of less than sixteen years on men's work; and, if not, whether, in view of the undesirability of the practice, he will issue an instruction upon the subject.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Instructions have already been issued that telegraph messengers under sixteen years of age should not be employed upon men's duties during the Christmas pressure if any other arrangement is practicable.

Morocco Postal System—Cash on Delivery.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can see his way to extending the cash-on-delivery system in Morocco to Casablanca, Mazagan, and Mogador; and if he can state to which towns in Morocco the French and German systems are extended.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am making inquiries as to the advisability of extending the cash-on-delivery system to the agencies maintained by the British Post Office in towns on the coast of Morocco. The postal union system for the collection of trade charges appears to be extended to all German postal agencies in Morocco; but the service, so far as the French agencies are concerned, is confined to parcels addressed to Tangier and Tetuan.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will the British subjects have the same facilities as foreigners?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is what I hope.

Adult Night Messengers in the Post Office.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that adult night-messengers at several offices have been informed that they must accept appointments as town postmen; and whether, as it was the clear intention of the recent Select Committee that they should be made established adult night-messengers, he will have them placed on the established list, as was done in the case of the unestablished telegraphists at the Central Telegraph Office.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: A number of adult night-messengers have been offered nominations to postmen's places, but there has been no compulsion. The postmen's places carry higher pay. All who are eligible under the recommendations of the Select Committee and who do not desire postmen's places will be established as adult night-messengers.

Elementary School Grants.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what grants in aid of elementary education are secured to the local education authorities by statute; what is the average amount per child; and what grants will be secured by statute to the local education authorities for elementary education if the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill becomes law in its present form.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. TREVELYAN, Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): The grants secured by Section 19 of the Elementary Education Act, 1876, Section 2 of the Education Code (1890) Act, 1890, Section 1 of the Elementary Education Act, 1891, and Section 10 of the Education Act, 1902. These grants amount, on the average, to about £1 per child in average attendance. It is generally admitted that the existing system is unsatisfactory, and it is, therefore, proposed to repeal these enactments in order to leave the way clear for the introduction of more satisfactory methods of distributing grants in aid of elementary education. For this purpose it is essential that the basis of distribution should not be defined by statute.

DR. RUTHERFORD: Will the new regulations be enacted by statute or by code?

MR. TREVELYAN: I presume by code.

Conditions of the Education Grant.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that there are now on the Statute-book about forty requirements to be fulfilled as a condition of public money being applied in aid of an elementary school, and that most of them are repealed by the Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill, and nothing put in their place; and, as that Bill is entitled a Bill to regulate the conditions on which public money may be applied in aid of elementary education, will he state the number and terms of the conditions remaining on the Statute-book if the Bill becomes law in its present form.

MR. TREVELYAN: The Bill now before Parliament provides that no grant shall be paid in respect of an elementary school other than a public elementary school, unless the conditions specified in Clause 2 are satisfied. I do not think it is possible to state the number and terms of the requirements which must be complied with if a school is to be recognised as a public elementary school.

Small Holdings and Allotments Act.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many schemes have been received by the Board of Agriculture up to date, and how many have been approved.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): One hundred and fifty-four schemes have been received, of which eighty-five have been approved, four disapproved and three withdrawn, leaving sixty-two still under consideration. In most of these cases the acquisition of the land has been approved, but the details of the scheme have not been finally settled.

MR. R. HARCOURT asked in how many counties no schemes had been submitted.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will give me notice of that Question.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): Can the hon. Gentleman say how many persons will be provided for by these schemes?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No, Sir.

Buildings on Small Holdings.

MR. R. HARCOURT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what county and parish councils are exercising the powers given them by the Small Holdings and Allotments Act for the erection of houses and buildings on small holdings and allotments.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: In the schemes approved the following county councils have arranged to erect houses and buildings on small holdings, viz.: Cambridge, Cornwall, East Riding of Yorkshire, Gloucester, Holland, Isle of Wight, Montgomery, Radnor and Worcester. We have no information at present as to the action taken in this direction by parish councils as they are not required to submit their proposals to the Board.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) asked whether in the last resort, if the county council refused to erect these houses, the Commissioners were empowered by the Act to erect them on their own initiative.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That is a very important question. The hon. Member must give me notice of it.

Records of Application for Small Holdings.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, of how many applications, out of the 23,000 applications which have been made for land under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, the Small Holdings Commissioners have particulars in their possession.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board do not keep a register of applications, not considering it necessary to do so, but they will be happy to obtain specific information from any county council about any particular application.

Proposed Register of Applications.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that, out of nearly 13,000 persons who have been approved by the county councils as suitable applicants for small holdings, only 595 have obtained land under the Act, he will now consider the advisability of establishing a register of applications so that every approved applicant may have a satisfactory assurance that his application will in time be dealt with.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: As I have previously informed my hon. friend, the Board do not propose to keep a register of the nature suggested, MR. MORRELL: Can the hon. Gentleman tell me how the Board will ascertain when it ought to enforce its powers?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board has full power to ascertain the particulars of any case.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will it ever be considered necessary?

MR. LUPTON: Will the hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of establishing a register without delay?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It is not necessary, as the Board can always apply to county councils for particulars of cases.

MR. MORRELL: But how is it possible for the Board to know in what cases it should apply for information?

Mr. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): Are not hon. Members raising a purely hypothetical case? Has any case actually arisen?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, Sir.

Small Holdings in Sussex.

MR. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the county of Sussex 330 applications for small holdings have been made, and 170 of these have been approved; whether no applicants have been provided for by the council and no land acquired; and what steps he proposes to take.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes. The county council are, however, obtaining valuations of several properties which have been offered them, and we hope that it will not be long before some land has been acquired.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that there are two county councils in Sussex?

MR. BEAUMONT: The figures in the Question apply to both divisions of the county.

Appeals against Rejections of Applications for Small Holdings.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, when the Board receives a specific complaint from any applicant for a small holding whose application has been refused, what method of investigating has it adopted.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The usual procedure is to ask in the first place for the observations of the county council. If the reasons assigned for the rejection appear insufficient, the county council is requested to reconsider the application. If necessary, an inspector is sent down to make a personal inquiry into the case. No case has occurred where a county council has refused to reconsider an application on being asked by the Board to do so.

County Council Administration of the Act.

MR. CROOKS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what means have been adopted to ascertain the extent of the demand for land in those counties where the county council has shown itself reluctant to administer the Act.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No county council has failed to take the necessary steps to ascertain the extent of the demand for small holdings and to invite applications, and the Board are in possession of full information as to the extent of the demand in each county.

MR. MORRELL: Is it the fact that many of the county councils have not yet completed their inquiries?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY asked for notice of the Question.

Small Holdings in Surrey.

MR. MARNHAM (Surrey, Chertsey): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the county of Surrey 244 applications have been made and 104 of these have been approved; that no applicants have yet been provided for by the council and no land acquired; and what steps he proposes to take.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The facts are as stated, but the difficulties of acquiring land in Surrey are exceptional owing to the building value of most of the land in those localities where there is a demand for small holdings. The county council are in active negotiation for land, and the Board are satisfied that they are carrying out their duties with all possible expedition.

Reports on Applications for Small Holdings.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if the Board will direct all county councils to make a full report on every application and to state in detail the reasons why any particular application is rejected.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The President does not think that any useful purpose would be served by adopting this suggestion. Full inquiry is made into every specific complaint that is received.

MR. BENNETT: But how does the Board know the number of applications rejected?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: A report is made to the Board on all applications, whether approved or disapproved.

EARL WINTERTON: Is it not the fact that the county council has quite as much knowledge of the nature of the application as the Board of Agriculture?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Naturally it has local and detailed knowledge.

MR. MORRELL: Have not the Commissioners reported that county councils take in many cases a very narrow view?

MR. BENNETT: And is it not the fact?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think hon. Members are rather exceeding their rights.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if, in view of the fact that the Board has only received copies of 2,360 applications out of 20,000 applications made to the county councils, the Board will issue instructions to county councils to forward immediately copies of all applications received.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are unable to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend, as it would place a great deal of additional work on county councils and on the Board without any corresponding advantage being gained. The Board are, however, in continuous communication with the county councils and do obtain any information they require from them as occasion arises.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): Will the Board instruct the county councils to give the reasons in all cases for rejecting applications?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, Sir.

Small Holdings Finance.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in a circular issued by the Board on 1st January it is stated that the expenses incurred in relation to the acquistion of land would ordinarily be held to include the expenses of any local inquiry; and whether this can therefore be paid out of the Small Holdings Account.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The local inquiries referred to are those held in connection with the application for a compulsory order. The expenses of such inquiries will be paid out of the Small Holdings account.

Small Holdings Records.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether it is the intention of the Small Holdings Commissioners to compile a complete record of all applications received and dealt with under the Small Holdings Act of 1907.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board can and do obtain from county councils any information they may require as to applications received, and the President does not think any useful purpose would be served by adopting the suggestion of my hon. friend.

MR. MORRELL: Is it possible to ascertain the demand for land as required by the Act without compiling a record?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Certainly. [Cries of "How?"]

Small Holdings in Staffordshire.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the county of Stafford 214 applications have been made for small holdings and 112 of these have been approved; that no applicants have yet been provided for by the council and no land acquired; and what steps he proposes to take.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes. The county council are, however, in negotiation for 520 acres, and the Board are informed that they hope to have acquired a considerable area by next Lady Day, which is the usual date of entry in the county.

Undischarged Bankrupts—Case of Mr. E. T. Hooley.

MR. W. E. HARVEY (Derbyshire, N.E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Mansfield division of Nottinghamshire, I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been directed to recent legal proceedings where one E. T. Hooley, of Nottingham, an undischarged bankrupt, was shown to be having large financial transactions in the name of his wife; will he say if he has any powers to prevent an undischarged bankrupt evading the bankruptcy law in this manner; and what steps, if any, he proposes to take.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields): I have received a communication from the solicitor to Mr. Hooley, in which he categorically denies the assertions contained in this Question. He adds that they appear to be founded on *ex parte* statements made in some litigation to which neither Mr. nor Mrs. Hooley was a party. However, as neither the solicitor nor my hon. friend could give me the date or particulars, I have not been able to learn much about it. If my hon. friend will be good enough to send me an authentic report of the statements on which he relies, I will see what can and should be done.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) asked whether the solicitor denied that Mr. Hooley was an undischarged bankrupt.

SIR W. ROBSON: I do not think the solicitor would deny that.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.): Is the hon. and learned Gentleman aware that Mr. Hooley is not of Nottingham, but a native of the same county as the hon. Member in whose name the Question appears on the Paper?

[No Answer was returned.]

Boycotting at Riverstown.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the boycotting during the past half-year of persons in the Riverstown district of county Sligo because they refused to join the United Irish League; and whether any Executive action has been taken, or is to be taken, to put a stop to the systematic intimidation practised upon these individuals.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Government has taken, and will take all possible steps to afford protection to any persons in the district who may require it, and the police force in the district has been largely reinforced with that object. As a prosecution is pending it is not desirable to make any further statement.

MR. LONSDALE: Why did the Executive allow six months to elapse before they took any action?

MR. CHERRY was understood to deny that they had done so.

Towerhill (Claremorris) Cattle Drive.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of an extensive cattle-drive at Towerhill, Claremorris, on the 7th instant; how many farms were raided; and whether any persons were arrested or prosecuted.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): This appears to be the cattle drive about which the hon. and gallant Member for East Down asked a Question yesterday. I would refer the hon. Member to my reply. I understand that the cattle were driven off three farms.

East Clare Moonlight Outrage.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received information of a moonlight outrage at Corbehagh, East Clare, at the house of a farmer named Cummins; whether shots were discharged through the windows of the dwelling; and whether any persons were arrested or proceeded against.

MR. BIRRELL: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that on the occasion in question four shots were fired outside Cummins' house, one of which passed through the window. No arrests have been made.

Ballyvourney Labourer's Cottage.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will cause inquiries to be made as to the reason for the rejection by the County Court Judge of the claim of William Sheehan to a labourer's cottage on the farm of Jeremiah Hegarty, Ballyvourney, county Cork; was the house in which the applicant resides condemned by the medical officer of health for the locality; and was the sole ground of opposition to this man's claim that he participated in an agitation for the acquisition by the Estates Commissioners of a large area of land owned by Mr. Hegarty for the purposes of distribution amongst the labourers and uneconomic holders in a congested district.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have not yet received a copy of the County Court Order in this case. It is the fact that the applicant's house was condemned as unfit for habitation. The petitioner, Mr. Jeremiah Hegarty, opposed the erection of the proposed cottage on several grounds, one of which was the unsuitability of the applicant.

Irish Intermediate Education Inspectors.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Commissioners of Intermediate Education in Ireland, having regard to the number of girls' schools which work under their supervision, to allot a due proportion of the new inspectorships to women.

MR. BIRRELL: It has been decided by the Commissioners of Intermediate Education that the first six inspectors to be appointed shall be men.

MR. KETTLE: Will there be any women inspectors appointed?

MR. BIRRELL: That is not a matter within my power, but I hope personally it will be possible to have women inspectors.

MR. KETTLE: Will the right hon. Gentleman represent his personal views to the Intermediate Education Board? He has great personal influence.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Gentleman must allow me to estimate the force of my personality.

Labourers Cottage Scheme in Charleville.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the decisions of Major Breddin, Inspector of the Local Government Board, in regard to the claims of labourers in the Charleville rural district have caused much dissatisfaction amongst the general body of applicants under the Labourers Act; did he reject forty-two applications for additional half-acres, although no opposition was offered by the occupiers in a large number of these cases; and, if so, will he state the reasons assigned for those rejections; were the applications of some labourers thrown out on the same grounds that they possessed a cow each; how long has this been recognised as a reason for rejection by inspectors of the Local Government Board; were others refused who were awarded prizes for the excellent way in which they cultivated their plots; and will he say whether a right of appeal should be given to labourers in cases such as these.

MR. BIRRELL: In this case forty-two applications for additional half-acres were rejected by the Local Government Board inspector, thirty-two because the existing allotments were very badly kept, and ten for various reasons which were communicated to the district council. The fact that the applicant kept a cow was not, and could not be, a ground of rejection in any case. The question whether a right of appeal should be given to labourers in rejected cases was considered when the Labourers Bill of 1906 was before Parliament and was decided in the negative.

Cork Land Purchase Scheme.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount of purchase money agreed to under the Purchase Act of 1903, up to 1st November last in the county and parliamentary borough of Cork, and what is the amount paid for up to that date; what is the acreage covered by the agreements; how many occupiers have purchased and at what percentage of reduction and number of years purchase in the second term, first term, and non-judicial categories respectively; what is the average percentage of reduction obtained by the tenant purchasers as compared with the average reduction under previous Purchase Acts, and how does the average percentage of reduction obtained by tenant purchasers in Cork compare with the average reduction obtained by tenant purchasers in the rest of Ireland, abstracting the results obtained by the agreements in the county and parliamentary borough of Cork; whether there is any reason to believe that the purchase transactions in Cork have not given substantial satisfaction, both to vendors and purchasers; and whether, under these circumstances, he will consider the advisability in his forthcoming Bill of laying down the average prices agreed to in Cork as standard prices, above which the bonus will not be payable, relieving the vendors at the same time of the expense of proving title by recognising the receipt of rent for a fair number of years as sufficient proof for all purposes.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that up to the 31st October 1908, 17,507 purchase agreements were lodged for the sale of holdings in the county Cork, comprising an estimated area of 865,000 acres; the purchase money applied for in these cases amounts to £8,202,219, which is said to work out at 21·3 years purchase as compared with an average of all classes of rent of 22·5 years purchase in the whole of Ireland, but this figure is subject to revision. Up to the same date £1,960,875 was advanced in respect of 3,961 of these holdings, comprising an area of 183,032 acres. The Commissioners are unable to state at present in respect of the agreements lodged to the 31st October, 1908, the number of years purchase and percentage of reduction in second term, first term, and non-judicial categories, as only a proportion of the agreements have been so classified and analysed, but the hon. Member will find, on page 4 of the last Annual Report of the Commissioners, dated 28th July last, by counties and provinces, the number of years purchase and percentage of reduction in these categories of rent as regards the agreements which it had been found possible so to classify and analyse to the date of such Report. As regards the Question how the percentage of reduction obtained by tenant purchasers under the Irish Land Act, 1903, compares with that obtained under previous Acts, I would refer the hon. Member to pages 14 and 15 of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Irish Land Purchase Finance, where the matter is dealt with at considerable length. There is no reason to doubt that the purchase transactions in Cork have given satisfaction to both parties concerned. As regards the hon. Member's suggestion relative to the bonus, I must ask him to await the introduction of the Bill. His suggestion in regard to title is, I fear, quite impracticable. Not only must there be a *prima facie* title to sell, but title must be fully proved before the purchase money can be distributed.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: As I understand, the Cork prices are, roughly speaking four years lower than the rest of Ireland. May I remind the right hon. gentleman he has omitted to answer my suggestion that the Cork prices should be standardised as the prices for the rest of Ireland. The figures he has given, as I suggest, would mean taking four years off the purchase price of the farmers of Ireland in general, and may I ask whether he is not aware that I have made that suggestion publicly on various occasions, and that it was never objected to by any landlord representative or by the landlord newspapers, provided always the vendors are relieved of the legal process of proving title?

MR. BIRRELL: I assure the hon. Member that we have been for weeks past considering the question on the very lines he has now suggested.

Land Purchase Statistics.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total amount of purchase money represented by agreements under the Purchase Act of 1903 up to 1st November last, with the number of purchasers and area of land covered by the agreements; what is the amount of purchase money remaining unpaid at that date; what is the number of tenant purchasers who have agreed to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$, $3\frac{3}{4}$, and 4 per cent. interest, respectively, on the purchase money pending completion of the sales; what is the annual amount of the loss sustained by each of these categories of tenant purchasers as compared with the annuity of $3\frac{1}{4}$, to which their payments would be reduced if the purchase money were available; and, in case the failure to supply the purchase money should continue for five years or over, what will be the total loss to the tenant purchasers up to the time when their ownership will begin; and whether the forthcoming Bill will make any provision to remedy this injustice.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the total amount of purchase money applied for, in the agreements lodged up to the 31st October last inclusive, in the case of direct sales was £69,595,103, the number of purchasers was 203,626, and the number of acres covered by the agreements was approximately 6,357,000. The amount of money applied for, but not advanced on that date, was £50,150,231. While the Land Commission, who collect the interest, know the rate which each purchaser has, by his purchase agreement, undertaken to pay, the agreements, as I stated to the hon. Member on the 11th instant, are not classified according to the different rates of interest. The Commissioners could not, therefore, give the numbers falling under each of the three headings mentioned in the Question without going over the whole 200,000 agreements again. I understand that the average rate of interest is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I quite understand the difficulty of arriving at these figures. May we hope that in his statement Monday next the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us some approximate of the penalty which the present breakdown involves upon the purchasing tenants?

MR. BIRRELL: Of course, I do not admit any breakdown.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Only two millions paid out of eight millions in County Cork.

MR. BIRRELL: The rate is going on as it always has been. There is no question of breakdown. Of course, the point the hon. member has in his mind is the difference between purchase annuity rate and the rate the tenant has to pay by way of interest upon the completion of his agreement, and I will certainly do my best to deal with that.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of purchase agreements lodged with the Estates Commissioners, under the Irish Land Act, 1903, up to the 1st November instant; the total amount of the advances applied for; the number of purchase agreements completed at that date, with the amount of the advances made; and the amount of the bonus paid or payable in respect of these transactions.

MR. BIRRELL: As regards the first part of this Question I would refer the hon. Member to the reply which I have just given to the Question asked by the hon. Member for Cork. The number of agreements for direct sales in respect of which advances had been made up to 31st October last inclusive was 45,707 and the amount advanced £19,444,872. The bonus paid or payable thereon at 12 per cent. amounts to £2,285,982.

MR. LONSDALE: Leaving a balance, therefore, of about nine millions?

MR. BIRRELL: No, no; certainly not.

Civilian Employment at Cork Barracks.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, although artisans and labourers employed at the Cork barracks have not technically been dismissed by the military authorities, they have been discharged by the triennial contractors, owing to the military authorities having allotted to the field company of the Royal Engineers a large proportion of the incidental work hitherto executed by civilian workmen; whether the field company would be sufficiently employed on field works at Moore Park and Kilworth camp, without taking the places of Cork working men at reduced wages; and whether, the War Office having pledged themselves to aid in coping with unemployment, they will withdraw these soldiers from competition with civilian workers at rates of pay inconsistent with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House.

MR. HALDANE: I have called for a report on the matter.

Riverstown (Sligo) Postmaster.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware of the character of the so-called Protestant Mutual Defence Association formed at Riverstown, county Sligo, for the purpose of intimidating Protestants and compelling them to transfer their custom from the Catholic to the Protestant traders and mechanics of that village and generally of creating in the district that ill-will which has recently eventuated in murder; whether it is with his sanction that one of the Protestant traders, the local postmaster, has assisted in founding this boycotting trade society with the sectarian name and actively practices its policy; and, if not, what action he proposes to take to restore the non-partisan character of the postal service in the Riverstown district.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the association referred to has been formed for the protection of the lives and property of Protestants who have been boycotted for refusing to subscribe to the funds of the United Irish League?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is hardly a Question which affects my Department. In reply to the hon. Member for Westmeath I have to say I am making inquiry into the matter, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member in due course.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 331.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 331.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 373.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B: Sir John Dewar; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Report to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

As amended, further considered.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) moved the omission of Clause 18, not in any partisan or factitious spirit, but in order that the House might have a further opportunity of discussing the principles that underlay it. They were now dealing with what might be called a temperance clause. Its object was, by reducing the facilities for drinking on a certain day of the week, to improve the morals of the people and to reduce drunkenness. He was not sure that to have an increase of drunkenness on Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday and a less amount of drinking on Sunday represented any movement towards temperance. It was only imposing restrictive and repressive influences on the community for a short period, and both before and after it would be possible to overleap the bounds. The financial clauses of the Bill had given great anxiety to the House, and had produced much bitter feeling, because it was felt that elements of injustice were present in them. But he did not think there would be on the part of any Member on either side of the House in regard to Sunday closing any bitter feeling or immoderation. He at any rate hoped to say what he had to advance in temperate language. The clause as it stood reduced the number of hours during which public-houses might be open on Sundays from six to three, although there would be a wide period from which the hours of opening could be selected. He did not propose to enter into a discussion of that Amendment or of the other proposal whereby a traveller must traverse an increased mileage in order to get refreshment on the Sabbath Day. These points would, he was sure, cause a good deal of discussion. Then Sunday closing was to be extended to Monmouthshire. He had no intention of discussing largely these two subsections, but he wanted to draw the attention of the House to some general considerations in regard to Sunday closing and the possible development of temperance under such a clause as this. He did not think the number of hours during which a public-house was open was at all the measure of the desire to acquire refreshments or of the use to be made of the facilities for drinking, and he was certain that unless the restrictions which they imposed had behind them the general feeling of the mass of the people they would fail. They must inevitably produce only irritation and the avoidance of the law. If they passed this clause they ought to be quite sure that the public would not be unduly inconvenienced; if they were unduly inconvenienced, they would take every opportunity to break the law. They ought not to carry restrictions to the point of prohibition. That was the danger, for if they carried restriction to the point of prohibition they invited the secret abuse of the law. It was notable that this clause, which was intended to promote temperance, gave a certain amount of facilities for the Sabbath Day, but they had in Clause 20 a power put into the hands of any individual licensing authority to prevent any public-house in their district from being opened on Sunday. He had always opposed local option, and from one standpoint only, not because he was in sympathy with drunkenness, but because he believed that all laws relating to the exercise of the human will in such things as drink should be general in their application throughout the whole area of nationa life. He did not believe that they ever could produce real reform by any fragmentary and fugitive application of restrictions in any one small area, because the character and the general approval of the people must be behind legislation or it would fail. It might be thought that in a place like Letchworth, which was a picked community, they would have an illustration of what could be done by local option, but it was very much open to question whether in establishing in one small community like that a principle of this kind, they served either the individual or the general interest. The individual who wanted to take advantage of opportunity would leave that place and go elsewhere to get what he wanted, and it was this fragmentary, occasional, and haphazard kind of restriction which in most cases would not be applied with the general approval of the community. Therefore, he said that this clause, which presumably was to give facilities for three hours on a Sunday, might in any particular licensing district be removed; they would have instead local option applied. Undoubtedly the Government believed that they were going to serve temperance by restricting the number of hours on which public-houses might be open on a Sunday, but supposing public opinion was not with the Government, what did they do? They only crowded into the three hours the same amount of drinking that they had before distributed over six hours. He honestly did not attach so much importance to the difference between three hours and six hours, but whatever importance might be attached to it, he supposed many people would say: "But you decrease the opportunities which working-men and others have for drink if you only open for a limited number of hours, and the fewer hours you open the less temptation, and, therefore, the less drinking there will be." He wondered if that was so. If there was less drinking on Sunday than upon any other day, was it due solely to the fact that public-houses were only open for six hours on that day? He did not believe it was. He believed that there was throughout this country a certain feeling attached to Sunday, a desire for quiet recreation, which reduced the drinking during that particular twenty-four hours. Of one thing he was certain, and that was that whatever this clause might accomplish, it would only restrict the opportunities of those who very properly wished to refresh themselves upon a Sunday, but his point was that it would be those on a lower level. A man in middle-class life could get in his supply of bottled beer or whisky or wine, and the rich man could have it in his cellar; there was no restriction upon him at all. But there was a remarkable limitation of the privileges of the working-man. He had some knowledge of the working-man, as good a knowledge, he thought, as some of the Labour Members, who assumed to know much more. Whether or not they approved of drink for the working-man, the working-man had an absolute right to have the same privileges for meeting the demands of his natural appetite as the rich man. The rich man had the opportunity given him by this House, and given to the poor man indeed by his club, but there were in his constituency, and in other constituencies, men who could not afford a club. They left the clubs open all day on Sunday with entertainments of various kinds for those working men who belonged to a club, but he thought it unfair to restrict the hours in which a man outside a club might have reasonable refreshment, and to give practically unlimited opportunities to the man inside a club. After all, what was the difference between a respectable public-house and a respectable club? There was very little. He thought it a lamentable thing that our public-houses should be what they were, and he frankly said that he thought it lamentable that there should be so many. He had never had any other view, but he had always been in favour of using the greatest discretion in limiting these houses, as was done under the Act of 1904. Wherever they had had absolute Sunday closing a great success, they had had behind it a well organised public opinion. He believed there was one place in the world where Sunday closing was an absolute success—in Canada. It was twenty-four years since he lived in Canada, but he saw very few changes when he went back. It was a curious thing that in Canada, where the influence of the Scotsman was so tremendous, Sunday closing should be a success and that in Scotland it was an absolute failure. It could not be suggested that it had been a success in Scotland. It had not reduced drunkenness; he would not say it had increased drunkenness, but he knew that drunkenness had not decreased in Scotland because of Sunday closing any more than drunkenness had decreased in Glasgow and Edinburgh when they began to close at 10 o'clock instead of an hour later, and when it was found that they only made excursions in vast numbers to Paisley and elsewhere in order to get what they required. Sunday closing had been a success in Canada, because the Canadian people in the mass were the most sober people in the world. It had been a success in Canada; but why? On the same basis that the stopping of all traffic on a Sunday was a success. There was a time when they could not go in a street car in Toronto or Montreal on a Sunday, or they could not get a cab, for the simple reason that there were no facilities, and public opinion was behind it. Public opinion had been behind Sunday closing in Canada; the people said they wanted it, and they adapted themselves to it because it sprung naturally out of their habit of mind and thought. What he wanted to show was that restrictions in this country did not spring from the natural instinct of the people. He did not think they had, in making their restrictions, a great body of opinion behind them, and it was not because of any lack of sympathy with making the Sabbath as holy as possible but because of the desire to see that they did not in their anxiety to secure greater temperance proceed with too great haste. The Prime Minister made a most moderate speech the other day upon this very clause. He said they ought not to move ahead of public opinion, and that that was why he could not consent to absolute Sunday closing—it would be ahead of public opinion. Now, he thought they were in danger of moving in too great haste; this was an experiment which the Government were going to impose upon the country. He had no doubt that if this Bill became law it would take some time to discover whether it produced the desired result, but he was certain that in any case figures would be made to prove a great deal. One could quote a great many figures with regard to drinking in Wales. One could suggest, as his noble friend beside him pointed out in the last debate, that Sunday closing had been an absolute failure in Wales, if they were to take the figures for drunkenness; but an hon. Member opposite had made a very able speech in which he tried to show that Wales was highly temperate and that whatever drunkenness there was in Cardiff was due to excursions made from elsewhere.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said the two Commissions appointed by the Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was the head, and composed of a majority of Tory Members, had proved conclusively that Sunday closing was a great success in Wales.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was only saying that they could make figures prove almost anything, but the House could see that he was not basing his arguments at all upon figures. He had been arguing upon a different basis. If Sunday closing proved a success, it would be because the general opinion of the country was behind it, and that it sprang naturally out of the character of the people. They were attempting a very serious experiment with this particular clause. He was sure that it was unwise further to restrict the hours in which public-houses should be open on Sundays. He believed that if they had them open for three hours they would only crowd into those three hours the amount of drinking that otherwise would be spread over six hours, and the effect, so far as drunkenness was concerned, would be *nil*, and the general moral result would also be *nil*. The complexities of a measure like this were naturally very great and the difficulties in the way of the Government which endeavoured to deal with temperance were very great. He did not want by anything he might say to make those difficulties greater, but he did say that in the last debate did not they have any good or well-founded arguments put forward why these restrictions should be made, and he hoped that that day convincing arguments would be adduced. As for applying the Sunday Closing Act to Monmouthshire, he could understand those who lived in Wales desiring to see that neighbouring county brought into line with their particular view but hon. Members opposite must not be surprised if it was pointed out from that side of the House that if drinking in Monmouthshire and in Wales was to be judged from the evidence of arrests for drunkenness, it would be found that the advantage lay with Monmouthshire. He believed, for instance, that there were ninety-one arrests for illicit sale of liquor in 1907 in Glamorganshire, and none in Monmouthshire. It was for the Government to show that there was good reason for believing that the inclusion of Monmouthshire in the area of Sunday closing would be for the good of that county, and would not lower instead of raising the *status* of morality there. He moved the rejection of the clause because he hoped there would spring out of it a discussion which would show to the House that the efforts of the Government in this particular clause could be well defended, and that the sense of the House as a whole was behind it, because unless they got the sense of the House and of the country as a whole behind every step they took in temperance reform or in any other moral reform, the result would only be to the disadvantage of the general character of the people and to the reduction of morality generally. He begged to move, EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) said his hon. friend had referred to certain figures that had been quoted by him with regard to drunkenness in Wales and Scotland, and had said that if those figures were to be taken as accurate they would show that Sunday closing had been a failure in Wales, and the hon. Member for Burnley somewhat discourteously stated that he would not take those figures. Those figures, however, did not come from his own side. His point was that if they were to go on figures with regard to drunkenness in Wales and Scotland for the last ten years from the findings of the Royal Commissions, there was nothing to lead the House to believe that the Government were justified in this principle of restriction.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): Does the noble Lord refer to figures with regard to Sunday drunkenness or with regard to drunkenness generally?

EARL WINTERTON said he was speaking with regard to the effect of restrictions on Sunday upon the amount of drunkenness, and he coupled with that what was quite as important, the number of prosecutions for illicit sales of drink.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: This is an important matter, and in order to make it clear, will the noble Lord state whether the figures as to Sunday drunkenness include arrests for drunkenness on Saturday night?

EARL WINTERTON said he did not propose to quote all these figures. He quoted them on the Committee stage of the Bill, and it was either the right hon. Gentleman himself or the Solicitor-General who said that figures could be made to prove anything. It had not been disputed on a former stage of the Bill that the figures for Scotland and Wales with respect to Sunday drunkenness and illicit sales showed that the effect of the Sunday restriction was to produce a large amount of sales of drink in unlicensed houses. Probably there would be less open drunkenness for the simple reason that people would get drunk on premises which were not under police control. If the effect had been to produce an enormous increase of illicit sales on Sunday, and not a corresponding decrease in drunkenness, then he said the system of restriction of sale on Sunday had broken down. He wished to put to the Government and their friends the temperance leaders, the exact position in which the country would be placed if the clause was adopted. The publicans of England would then be under what might really be described as three different laws or sets of regulations. In the first place, they would have to provide food without alcohol at any time, day or night, from twelve o'clock midnight on Saturday to twelve o'clock on Sunday night. Secondly, they would be under another regulation with regard to the sale of drink with meals. A publican was allowed, and, in fact, more or less compelled under the Bill, to supply alcohol with meals to any person who desired it on Sunday during those hours at which he was permitted to supply it at the present time. Thirdly, as he understood, the publican was permitted to supply drink with any kind of meal for one hour between noon and 3 p.m., and for any two hours between 6 p.m. and 10 p.m. He had not the least hesitation in saying that there had never been anything in a Bill passed through that House so confusing and muddling as the regulations now set forth. They had never been dreamt of by any other Government or included in any other Bill. The President of the Board of Trade, speaking in the country a short time ago, said that the greatest intellects of the land were ranged on the side of this Bill.

MR. HODGE (Lancashire, Gorton): Hear, hear.

EARL WINTERTON said that no doubt the hon. Gentleman agreed with the President of the Board of Trade. All he could say was: If the right hon. Gentleman is right, may Providence protect any country in which the greatest intellects after thinking over it for two years can produce no clearer clause than that which we are discussing. He appealed to the Government on this point to take some step either there or in another place to have the regulations made clearer for the unfortunate publican. Referring to the first subsection of the clause dealing with the restriction of hours on Sunday, he said that, so far as he understood, there was nothing in the Amendments made by the Solicitor-General at the beginning of the Report stage which would safeguard the working man who wished to obtain his Sunday beer to drink with his dinner. It appeared to him that some districts would be absolutely prevented from supplying it if the magistrates chose to pass a regulation making the hour for Sunday opening between 2 and 3 o'clock. That would absolutely preclude the working man from obtaining a supply of beer for his dinner unless he chose to take his dinner in the public-house, which he was sure no hon. Member desired to see him do. That was an important point upon which the Government should give the House their views. It seemed to him that it would be very harsh that persons who had no cellarage accommodation in their own houses should be compelled practically to forego liquor for their Sunday dinner by reason of this restriction. As the Leader of the Opposition had pointed out on the Committee stage, the restriction might lead to the risk of working men laying in a supply not of beer, but of spirits and other liquors which were more easily stored than beer, and using them before the time of the Sunday dinner. It was important from the national point of view that the people of England should not be encouraged to drink spirits instead of beer. He should have thought the Government would have been most anxious to arrive at a compromise on this matter by which a regular hour would have been indicated for the opening of licensed houses on Sunday morning in all districts. He thought the arrangement of having houses open from 12 to 1 in one district, 1 to 2 in another, and 2 to 3 in the third was open to all kinds of objections while furnishing no possible advantage. As to the second subsection, dealing with the *bona fide* traveller, he desired to put a direct question to the Government and the hon. Member for Appleby and his friends. It seemed to him that the clause was based on a false idea. He imagined that the original framers of the Act dealing with *bona fide* travellers had two objects in view: firstly, they laid down the proposition that a traveller was entitled to a preference over other members of the public; and secondly, that in order to define a traveller it must be laid down how far he had travelled. He wanted to know in what way this clause from the temperance point of view bettered the present position. Why was a man who walked six miles more entitled to alcoholic refreshment than another who had walked three miles? Why was the man who walked six miles less likely to abuse the privilege? For the sake of illustration he supposed that two persons set out from the City of Westminster to walk towards South London. The first gentleman stopped in the borough of Peckham, where everybody got drunk on election days and succeeded in evading the vigilance of the police, and the second gentleman walked on to Balham or Mitcham. These two men were not specially addicted to the abuse of alcoholic liquors. Did the Government think that the man who walked to Balham or Mitcham was less likely to get drunk than the man who stopped at Peckham? He should say that the man who walked the greater distance was more likely to be thirsty. The whole thing seemed to him to be absolutely absurd. He had heard no reason to show that this clause was likely to improve the position. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might say it was not a very large alteration in the law and that it would not make much difference anyway. He regarded it as only another instance of the vexatious interference with the liberty of the subject which this Bill contemplated. In regard to Monmouthshire he would like some statement from the Government and from members of the temperance party representing Wales why it was necessary to include that county in the Welsh clause of the Bill. So far as he could gather from the figures there was less drunkenness in Monmouth than in the neighbouring county of Glamorgan, and he saw no reason why Monmouth should be included in the clause. It was perfectly true the Royal Commission desired to see the principle which had been put in force in Wales carried further and applied to the counties contiguous, but if they were going to do that there was no reason why they should not include Devonshire, Somersetshire, and other places. He had no doubt there was some reason for it, but he would like to ask the Government what was that reason. No doubt it would be said that the people of Monmouth were unanimously in favour of Sunday closing. But even if they were so, what was the reason for taking the county of Monmouth and making the law there different from what it was in the other counties of England? This was only another instance of the extraordinary things which the Government were anxious to do in order to please the extreme temperance party. He hoped that the House in discussing this clause would consider the actual effect of its provisions and not whether theoretically the restrictions on the opening of licensed premises on Sunday were good and desirable. If they were to discuss that, they on that side of the House would be compelled to take up the gauntlet thrown down, and go into the whole question of the facilities which existed elsewhere for Sunday drinking. He held that the House should consider the actual effect, the vexatious effect, which the proposals in the clause would have on the general public and the hardship which they would involve to members of the trade. The House should also consider the general effect which these proposals would have as part of a Bill, a large portion of the objects of which seemed to him, from the speeches which had been made both inside and outside the House, not to produce more temperance or less drinking, but to produce the maximum of annoyance to those persons in the country from whom the Party opposite disagreed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out Clause 18."—(*Sir Gilbert Parker.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'except,' in page 13, line 4, stand part of the Bill."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.): The noble Lord who has just addressed the House said that the provisions of the clause we are now discussing were more confusing and more muddling than any other clauses in the Bill. I do not admit that any clause in the Bill is confusing or muddling, and I say that this clause is neither the one nor the other. I will explain to the House in a few words what the clause really means. It consists of four provisions. In the first place it says that the hours of Sunday closing outside the Metropolis shall be reduced from six to three. That is fairly simple. In the next place, that the hours for Sunday closing in the Metropolis shall be reduced from seven to four. That is equally simple. Then next, the distance which a man may travel before he can call himself a *bona-fide* traveller is increased from three to six miles. That is a simple arithmetical sum. The fourth provision is that the Sunday Closing (Wales) Act of 1881 shall extend to the county of Monmouth.

EARL WINTERTON: I referred not to this particular clause, but to the general effect of the new regulations with regard to Sunday closing. That is what we have to consider.

SIR S. EVANS: I understood that the argument of the noble Lord was that the clause was confusing and muddling. I quite see how he tries to bring in some other consideration in order to introduce confusion in the discussion of the clause. The hon. Member for Gravesend made a speech covering a great deal of the ground which may be covered in a general discussion on temperance reform, and he expressed the hope that there wouldspring up such a discussion, because such a clause as this would not be efficacious if it was against the sense of the House and the country. I am not sure whether I am in order in following the hon. Member for Gravesend. Fifteen or sixteen years ago I was much more familiar with the strict rules of the debates of this House than I am now; but I have some recollection that there is a rule of procedure much more honoured in the breach than in the observance, that when the House was considering a Bill on the Report stage, it was not supposed to know anything of what had taken place in Committee. That was a strict rule in the old days. I do not say it is obsolete; but it is more honoured in the breach than in the observance now. We had a remarkable discussion upon the provisions of this clause when in Committee. At that time the Metropolis was excluded from the operation of the clause altogether, for the reason that the Metropolis had always been differently dealt with, at least in degree, in this matter, from other portions of the country. But by reason of the most interesting discussions on the Committee stage, by reason, for instance, of the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition and other hon. and right hon Members, by reason of the expressions of opinion from all quarters of the House.—[OPPOSITION cries of "No,"]—he did not mean from all Members in the House, but from all quarters of the House—it was decided to extend the provision with regard to Sunday closing to London and restrict the hours for opening from seven to four while in the country the hours were reduced from six to three. This is not the time to discuss local option generally, although it was introduced into his speech by the hon. Member for Gravesend. He further introduced into his speech observations which would have been more pertinent to Clause 20. The question that arises on this clause is whether or not it is in the public interest to diminish the hours for merely drinking in bars in a public-house. I will only make a few observations upon it. I think that no one would now argue that we ought to go back to the time when there was no restriction at all with reference to drinking facilities either during week days or Sundays. It was ordained so far back as 1872 that the public -houses in populous places should be closed at eleven o'clock, in non-populous places at ten and in London at half-past twelve; and I make bold to say that never in the course of these debates and never in any discussions on the question of temperance has it been suggested that these restrictions have been productive of anything but good. No one would argue that we should go back to the time when public-houses could be open at any time in the morning or night. But with regard to Sunday closing the question of Sunday drinking is a most interesting one, looked at historically and politically. [OPPOSITION ironical cries of "Hear, hear."] Yes, most interesting. There has been from the first time when legislation was passed in regard to the matter, a larger restriction on Sunday than on other days of the week. I agree that that arose from a desire to obtain respect for the Sabbath. It would be entirely out of place for me to discuss here and now the Sabbath as a divine institution; but I myself am profoundly of opinion that, as a human institution, the Sabbath or Seventh day, is one which we should preserve, and that is at the bottom of these regulations with regard to Sunday closing. I say that not only in the interest of those people who go to a public-house merely to drink, but in the interest of the people who keep licensed houses. I speak of what I know. In my own district I say that the licensed victuallers, or, at any rate, the more respectable portion of the licensed victuallers, would not dream of going back to the days when there was no restriction of the hours of Sunday opening. If that be so, we say three hours in the country and four hours in London are quite sufficient for Sunday drinking. As to the working man getting his dinner-beer on Sunday mentioned by the noble Lord, I can only say that his dinner-beer can be got quite easily in one hour; and the reason why we made that hour elastic was to make it possible for the justices, who know the circumstances of the locality, to make it perfectly convenient for the working man to provide his fresh dinner-beer for consumption in his own house at the ordinary dinner hour of the locality. Let me deal with the question of Sunday closing more generally. It may be said that three hours opening are sufficient for the country, but that four hours are not sufficient in London. There was a recommendation in both the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Licensing Commission in favour of the restriction of the drinking hours on Sunday. Let me deal now, however, with the last portion of the clause as to Monmouthshire and Sunday closing. The noble Lord said that he had never heard of any reason why Monmouthshire should be included in the Sunday Closing Act for Wales of 1881. Now, we had a very interesting debate on this matter in which the four Members representing the four divisions of Monmouthshire and a fifth who represented a county borough—Newport—all spoke in favour of Sunday closing in Monmouthshire. I made a few observations myself on this matter, and I know Monmouthshire very well. The noble Lord said, "Why not include Herefordshire ?" At one time Herefordshire was a Welsh county but not so Welsh as Monmouthshire, and the latter must always remain to all intents and purposes a Welsh county. It was formed for the first time in the reign of Henry VIII. out of the marshes or Monmouth and the position of Monmouth in regard to its contiguity to Wales and with regard to the beautiful river which flows through the country is the strongest geographical reason on both sides why Monmouthshire should have extended to it the benefits of the Sunday closing provision in Wales. I summed up on that occasion the reasons why Monmouthshire should be included, but I have not my notes with me. I think I said that for political, ethnological, historical, episcopal, geographical, and for every other reason that I knew of, Monmouth ought to be included. With regard to the operation of the Act in various parts of the country, we have the most extraordinary consensus of opinion. First of all, we had a remarkable speech from my right hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone near me with regard to the operation of the Sunday Closing Act in Ireland, now surely historical, which was most interesting and instructive. The measure for Sunday Closing covered the whole of Ireland, except the five most populous cities or towns, but that was only a temporary Bill. It was included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill every session. I think that went on for over twenty years and it was possible for anybody by merely raising his hat to exclude that Act from the operation of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, which comes up every year for discussion. That Act which was passed only as a temporary measure was included in that Bill year by year for nearly twenty years, when it became with everybody's consent permanently the law of the land for the whole of Ireland. We had a remarkable speech from the Lord Advocate who justified Sunday closing in Scotland, and we know that those of us who represent Wales, not only from our own experience are in favour of it, but we can point to the Report of the Commission presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh—a body which was called into being by those who at that time made it their business to attack Sunday closing—which is unanimous and is to the effect that the Sunday Closing Act has been beneficial in Wales, and that there ought to be no attempt to repeal it. Surely that being so, we can refer to other parts of this land, where Sunday closing has been put into operation, and we can say that it has worked for the good of the community, and as I have said, those who have experienced the benefits of it, who are engaged in the trade itself, would never dream of going back to the state of things which existed before the Acts came into force. We have put the restrictions in England and London on practically the same footing in regard to Sunday closing. It seems to be acknowledged that England and London are not prepared to vote for Sunday closing, but the principle is the same and I have discussed them generally in that way. The only other matter that remains for me to deal with is the question of the *bona fide* traveller. Upon this question we have the support of, I think, all the members of the Licensing Commission except two. We have the Report of the majority and the minority of the Commissioners upon it. In the one case, if I remember aright, the recommendation was that the three miles should be extended to six, and in the other it was that the three miles should be extended to seven. The noble Lord put some questions which would be very interesting if it were possible to discuss them, as to the possibility of a man getting more drunk after he had travelled six miles than after he had travelled three. I do not know how that is, but if I may go back for a moment to the question of Sunday closing, I think I may say that, generally speaking, if you open for six hours on Sunday instead of three, there is double the probability of a man's getting drunk. But in the case of the *bona fide* traveller there is nothing logical in it at all. We must deal with this matter practically. There is no difference logically between two and a half miles and three and a half miles; there is no difference between five and a half miles and six and a half miles, but we must deal with this matter practically, and what was borne in upon the Commission, and what is known to every Member of this House, is that there are men who will travel for three miles for the purpose of getting drink; there are other persons who travel for six miles not for the purpose of getting drink, but who may desire refreshment when they get to that point of their journey. I say that underlying the Reports of both sets of Commissioners and this provision is the fact that you have in practice, as everybody well knows, actual mischief arising from the distance of three miles, and that you have people going three miles or three miles and a half for the purpose of getting drink. As a matter of law, if the law was strictly applied, the mere fact of a man's having travelled three miles does not entitle him to a drink at all; he does not thereby become a *bona fide* traveller; but in practice it is held that if a man has gone on his bicycle or legs or has travelled in any other way three miles, he probably is a *bona fide* traveller. In order to get rid of a practical mischief with which everybody is acquainted, therefore, it is desirable to extend the distance for which a man must have travelled before he is a *bona fide* traveller. A man may travel for six miles and if it is clear to the bench that he did it for the purpose of getting drink he is not a *bona fide* traveller at all. But if he travels six miles and he is *bona fide* in other respects he will be entitled under this law to be supplied. I have gone much more fully into this than I intended to do, but it is a very interesting subject. The change which is being made is not very much, but we think it is entirely wholesome and in the right direction, and I say that with regard to the fair, simple, clear, and unconfused provisions of the Bill, with regard to the reduction from six hours to three in the country, and from seven hours to four in London for ordinary drinking purposes, with regard to the extension of the distance now constituting a man a *bona fide* traveller, and particularly with regard to Sunday closing in Monmouthshire, I think it is the overwhelming desire of this House to give effect to those clauses, and that they should become portions of this measure.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said he had listened with that respect which was due to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor-General and to his justification of this clause, and at last they had it officially declared on behalf of His Majesty's Government that the justification for the Sunday closing portion of the clause was purely, absolutely, and wholly sabbatarian. [Cries of "No."]

SIR S. EVANS: What I said was that in a great measure the feeling underlying the measure was decidedly sabbatarian, but I did not myself put it upon that ground. I put it upon the advisability as a human institution.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said he understood the Solicitor-General to say that treating Sunday not necessarily as a divine but as a human institution, he strongly entertained the view (he presumed speaking for the Government) that it was necessary or desirable that all sections of the community should offer some special recognition of that day. The hon. and learned Gentleman did not say one word beyond that in justification of this clause. He did not dispute the proposition that on Sunday there was less drinking than on any other day of the week. He did not dispute that, but what he did say was that many of the arrests for drunkenness on Sunday were attributable to Saturday drinking. Of course they were.

SIR S. EVANS: I did not say that.

MR. BOTTOMLEY apologised, but said the statement was certainly made in the course of the debate. The hon. Members for Spen Valley and for Appleby had said scores of times that they could not look at the figures of Sunday because they related to drinking on Saturday. But if it was a true criticism to say that, surely it was quite arguable and legitimate to say that the enormously greater drunkenness on Monday was due to the enforced closing on Sunday, and was it not true to say that the knowledge, as closing time on Saturday arrived, that there would be no opportunity of drinking till Monday, induced the regular drinker to lay in an extra stock of alcoholic liquor while he had the opportunity? So far as Sunday closing was concerned, he desired to remind the Government once more that he had asked many times in this discussion why was Sunday chosen for special treatment, apart from the sabbatarian argument, which was out of date in the twentieth century. This House of Commons was surely not going to say that the view of one section of the community as to how any one day should be spent should be enforced upon other sections and upon all differing from that view. He said, openly and candidly, and with no sense of shame, that he saw no sanctity in the seventh day as distinguished from the sixth or any other day. He thought it was as much the duty of a man to be sober on Saturday as it was on Sunday and equally on Monday, and he saw no necessity for saying that there must be some extraordinary provision to keep men sober on one day of the week. He recognised no ecclesiastical argument in a secular assembly like the House of Commons. What argument had ever been adduced in favour of Sunday closing? There was not 50 per cent. of the amount of drink consumed on Sunday as on Monday and not 25 per cent. as compared with Saturday. Then why choose Sunday? Let the House look at statistics for drunkenness on Sunday, taking parts of the United Kingdom which were comparable. In England it was ·50 per 1,000 of the population; in Scotland, where they had all the blessings of Sunday closing, it was ·85 per 1,000; in Ireland the same and in Wales 1·15. There was no reason why they should have Sunday closing. The argument about rest for the employes was not maintainable. The employees had not asked for it, and when the Solicitor-General said he was concerned for the workers in the trade why was he not concerned for the railway workers on Sundays? Why should they work or why should other people? That argument was cant, and he did not withdraw or qualify that expression. On the temperance aspect there was no ground whatever for Sunday closing. He awaited an answer to his question as to why one particular day was selected for special treatment. He was not going to Sweden or to other parts of the world for lessons. He was quite prepared to look at home, although he was prepared to argue that point with hon. Members at a more convenient opportunity than the present. Only that day he had received an immense amount of evidence from New Zealand showing the extraordinary trouble to which the police were put as the result of Sunday closing there. He had read in the police Court reports of the last few weeks of the terrible drunkenness in private drinking establishments in Cardiff. Apart from the sabbatarian argument there was no justification at all for Sunday closing. He was told that all this solicitude was for the welfare of those engaged in the trade. He would remind the House that this sort of protection extended to those who did not ask for it was like the protection of the vulture which covered its prey before it devoured it. Another argument was that every piece of literature which came to Members of the House in regard to Sunday closing contained this sabbatarian argument. He had letters from the Church Temperance Association and the Lord's Day Observance Association and other associations of that kind, and they all quite honestly proclaimed the fact that it was the better recognition of Sunday which concerned them, and they did not regard the matter from any other point of view. Then they had a memorial asking that whatever facilities were taken away from public-houses for supplying alcoholic liquors on a Sunday should be equally taken away from clubs and other unlicensed drinking premises. With regard to the provision of the Bill relating to Monmouthshire he was not qualified to say much. Everybody connected with Monmouthshire wanted to put the future difficulty further away from them than it was at present. The chief constable for Monmouthshire two or three years ago issued a report in which he said that Sunday closing in Wales had been a curse to Monmouth, and that it would be a sorry day for Monmouth when the provisions for Sunday closing were extended to that county. That vindicated the very argument of those who, like himself, were opposed to the kind of legislation as indicated by this subsection. All those people, to pass this evil on to their neighbours and give the benefit of this repressive legislation to somebody else over the border——

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): Is that an evil?

MR. BOTTOMLEY said he did not quite appreciate the interruption. The hon. Member, he believed, had the privilege of introducing a Sunday closing resolution, and he stated quite distinctly and honestly that his motive was almost entirely sabbatarian because he said he believed temperance was a good thing, and therefore, he intended to do his best to introduce it into the House of Commons. [Cheers.] Those cheers were the best vindication of his argument that something other than temperance reform lay at the back of this subsection. What justification had the Solicitor-General for it? Had there been any real complaint prior to the introduction of this Bill that the *bona fide* traveller clause was being abused? The Solicitor-General had said there were a certain class of men who would go three miles to get a drink. Even if they stopped there he would say they well deserved it. But they had to go three miles back. But surely a man was not to be discouraged from a six miles walk simply because he might sandwich between the two halves of the walk a glass of ale or a whisky and soda. The effect of making it six miles would be to discourage a man taking that healthy exercise of a walk on Sunday. What man was going to start out on a twelve miles walk in order that he might get a drink? They talked about class legislation, but every man with a motor car or a horse and trap could go out and drink as much as he liked on a Sunday, whereas the poor man who took his wife and family out could not get any refreshment without going twelve miles. There was no justification for the clause, and no argument had been adduced by the Solicitor-General, who had simply glided over the whole clause. The hon. and learned Gentleman had not said why the Government had increased the distance to six miles. He had merely said that some Members of the Commission suggested five and some seven. What had that to do with it? It was convenient to quote the Royal Commission in some cases and not in others. This Bill said that the hours of Sunday closing in London should be reduced, but the Royal Commission held the contrary opinion. They were entirely against Sunday closing, but said if they curtailed the hours at all they should leave London and the other large cities untouched. The Solicitor-General did not quote the Royal Commission on points like those.

SIR S. EVANS: Both the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Royal Commission gave that figure. One gave six and another gave seven miles limit.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said his complaint was that the Solicitor-General had not told the House why the Government had extended the section. What abuse had there been by the *bona fide* traveller? The police had been hard enough on the publican who served a glass of beer to a man who had not come three miles. There had been many prosecutions under this clause, and he wished to know the reason for this fantastic legislation under which a man who took a walk on Sunday morning with his family could not get a glass of beer without going twelve miles. He was surprised to read in the *Daily News* yesterday morning a strong recommendation to its readers to spend from Friday to Tuesday in Paris. The *Daily News* with a special heading "Friday to Tuesday in Paris" pointed out the wonderful facilities which certain railway companies were now giving to such of its readers who cared to escape the effect of this Bill. What was the experience of the whole world during the recent Franco-British Exhibition? He had heard of the hundreds of persons in Paris who would have come here and contributed to the success of the exhibition but for our absurd sabbatarian views. They could not go to the exhibition on Sunday and could not enjoy reasonable recreation. Now even this great organ of the Nonconformist conscience told its readers that the only way to spend a decent Sunday after this Bill had become law was to take a Friday to Tuesday trip to Paris. There had been no serious justification for those oppressive provisions in the Bill. When the Prime Minister introduced the Bill and explained its main provisions they were never led to expect that it would be an omnibus measure with all these concessions to the extreme advocates of temperance reform. No case whatever had been made out for Sunday closing. The Home Secretary had quoted statistics to show that Sunday was the sober day of the whole week, but they had the statistics of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, which showed that there was no decrease in the amount of alcohol consumed through Sunday closing. There was just as much alcohol consumed per week as there was before Sunday closing came into operation, and if there was less consumed on Sunday it must follow that there was more consumed on Saturday and Monday. As far as the *bona fide* traveller was concerned the provision was absolutely grotesque, and he certainly hoped that if this clause could not be amended in the House of Commons it would meet with more reasonable consideration elsewhere.

*MR. HODGE said that in addition to the reasons advanced by the Solicitor-General as to why this clause should be extended to Monmouth he would like to advance one more, which was an industrial one. In the trade with which he was associated he found that in South Wales they had Sunday closing and the minimum of Sunday work, and for the last twenty years they had endeavoured to do away with Sunday work in England. But they had been told by the large employers of labour that they were afraid that if they acceded to that request while there was no Sunday closing in the country it would result in many of the workmen turning out to work in an unfit condition, a danger to themselves, their fellow workmen, and to the machinery of the firm. He hailed with extreme satisfaction the extension of Sunday closing to Monmouth for the reason that the large steel works there insisted upon their men starting at six o'clock on Sunday night, which would not be the case if Sunday closing were in operation. In fact one of the largest firms in Monmouthshire were under obligation to permit a start at midnight on Sunday so soon as the Sunday Closing Act was extended to Monmouthshire. The question had been asked if restriction led to less consumption of alcohol. His experience was that it did. If it did not, why did the great employers of labour limit the facilities for their workmen getting liquor? He had in his mind one of the largest steel concerns in the country, the Steel Company of Scotland, where at one time the men had the privilege of going out whenever they liked for the purpose of alcoholic refreshment. The privilege was abused by many of the workmen. A change in management caused an awakening to the fact; the new manager realised that this abuse was bad for the men and bad for the plant of the firm, and the general manager wrote to him asking whether he could suggest any means by which the privilege could be restricted without doing any injury to the men. He wrote and said he thought the only way in which the men could be prevented from going out just as they pleased and remaining out as long as they pleased was that when a man considered that he was in want of alcoholic refreshment he should get a written permit from the foreman. This at once prevented the abuse of the privilege, the result being an immense gain to the men, and also an immense gain so far as the work of the firm was concerned. Some time afterwards the general manager expressed his satisfaction at the great benefit which had been conferred as the result of that action. He could name numerous other instances of a similar character where restriction had led to lessened consumption of alcohol and to the benefit of all concerned. For the fact that the amount of Sunday labour would be lessened in the great steel industry, he welcomed the extension of Sunday closing to Monmouthshire, and his personal regret was that it had not been extended to England as well. He did not know what the case might be with other Members, but for himself he had placed before his constituents that he was a Sunday closer, and he was quite satisfied that if he went before them on a future occasion he would receive the same support as he had got on the last occasion. Some reference had been made to Scotland, and, having resided there for the greater part of his life, he was in a position to testify to the benefits which arose from Sunday closing. In the town of Motherwell with which he was acquainted, there were certain hotel licences. The licensing law in Scotland was slightly different from what it was in England. There were seven-day or hotel licences, and the consequence of Sunday closing was that a certain section of people travelled three miles, frequently further, to get to that town, where they took advantage of the hotels, with the result that there was an enormous number of drunken people there on a Sunday. The magistrates, when they rose to a sense of their responsibility, took the seven-days licences completely away, with the result that they might travel through the town on a Sunday without seeing one drunken person. He thought that afforded evidence of the beneficial results which attended restriction. Something had also been said with respect to London, which, it was submitted, should not be interfered with. But those, who like himself, took an interest in mission work in some of the lower localities of the Metropolis, in slum districts, such as East Greenwich and Deptford, had only to spend a few hours in those parts on a Sunday to see the absolute necessity of something being done for the benefit of the people. He trusted that on a future occasion they would see the Sunday Closing Act extended, not only to Monmouth, but to the whole of England.

MR. FLETCHER (Hampstead) said he should have agreed with what the Solicitor-General had said in reference to restriction, if the Bill had provided that the money to effect that object should be derived from some other source than that proposed. Not one penny was to be paid by the State in furtherance of temperance by means of restriction. It was most unfair that they should diminish the brewers' and publicans' opportunities to earn their living at the same time that they increased the burdens put upon them. He lived in a most attractive locality, to which thousands of people came every Sunday. There was a well-known and well-conducted hotel there. All the time he had lived there he had never seen any rowdyism. The people who frequented the hotel were of the middle-class, and mostly foreigners, who ordered dinner to which they sat down after their walk. That form of taking pleasure was attended with no bad results. This clause would operate most unfairly on the hotel in question, which did more business on the Saturday and Sunday afternoon than during the whole of the rest of the week. The clause would not only be unjust to the hotel-keepers, but it would be a source of extreme inconvenience to the many visitors and the people who lived in the locality. Indeed, he did not think a more inconvenient clause could have been framed. He could speak of other and similar localities about twenty miles from London where on Saturdays and Sundays the people were all *bona fide* travellers. They did not go merely to drink; they visited those places for the purposes of enjoying the neighbourhood. They were mostly foreigners, who, they knew, were infinitely more temperate than the Anglo-Saxon. The Government had adopted the most inconvenient arrangement. It would have been far better to fix the hours of opening. It would be extremely difficult for a respectable working man to get his beer on a Sunday, unless the justices fixed the hour of opening at between twelve and one; but what was to happen to the *bona fide* traveller who arrived at a quarter past one?

SIR S. EVANS: There is no change whatever in the hours as regards the *bona fide* traveller. The hours at present fixed are applicable to the *bona fide* traveller. It is only a question of distance, that is all.

MR. FLETCHER: As long as no one is prejudiced.

SIR S. EVANS: Not at all.

MR. FLETCHER said that that removed the part of his argument with which he had been dealing. He had only risen to point out the serious injustice of making the licensing trade pay increased compensation at the same time that they diminished their power of making a profit. He was in favour of the argument of the Solicitor-General about the restriction of hours on Sunday, if the right people paid for their temperance views. It would be far more just that those who were merely a minority should pay the compensation rather than members of the trade whose earning powers were interfered with.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said the hon. Member for Hackney had delivered a very able and closely reasoned speech, but he trusted the hon. Gentleman was wrong in thinking that Sabbatarian feeling was dead in this country. He thought the hon. Member was wrong, and he was glad of it.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said he did not say that the Sabbatarian feeling was dead, but that it was declining.

*MR. REES said he understood the hon. Gentleman also to have said that it did not become the House of Commons, representatives of the nation, to deal with that aspect of the case. The Continental Sunday was contrasted by the hon. Gentleman with the English Sunday. He did not mean to say that he had any personal feeling in the matter, but the Continental Sunday was the outcome of what a great historian described as "a gorgeous and Imperial superstition." He was not concerned to justify that description, and equally unable to criticise it, but it might fairly be said, in Wales at any rate, that Sunday and the way in which it was observed, if he might use the antithesis, was a democratic exposition of Free Church feeling, which he thought it would be very wrong in any Member from Wales to ignore. There could be no doubt the feeling in Wales in favour of Sunday closing and Sunday observance was very strong, and as one of its representatives, he took the opportunity of saying so. The noble Lord who seconded the Motion for the omission of the clause described Monmouthshire as an unfortunate county. That was a most unfortunate description. Monmouthshire was in the position of a small county which was wooed by two great neighbouring countries, and which was a fine example of fidelity in that it clung to the smaller and poorer, but dearer and older love. His revered leader, the Member for Glamorganshire, when he had previously said a word or two on this subject, had taken him to task and gently rebuked him afterwards for not having pointed out that he himself was a Monmouthshire man. He therefore took the earliest opportunity of saying that he himself had taken the earliest opportunity that offered of acquiring that qualification. There was high authority for saying that to be born in a stable did not make a man a horse, but the House might take it from him that to be born in Monmouthshire did make a man a Welshman. He did not make any general attack on the speech of the hon. Member for Gravesend, but he did not understand what the hon. Gentleman said about their being afraid having a bad case against Sunday closing, nor did he think the hon. Member was happy in his dealing with the reports and statistics. In 1890, the Royal Commission on Welsh Sunday Closing recommended that the Act should be retained, strengthened, and extended to Monmouthshire. In 1899, the Royal Commission had reported favourably on Sunday closing in Scotland, Ireland and Wales, and recommended the extension of the Act to Monmouthshire, and to reduce the hours of sale in England. Again, the convictions for Sunday drunkenness were compared. In Cardiff, in 1881, the year before the Act, there were sixty-two convictions for a population of 80,000. Under Sunday closing the average per year for eight years ending December, 1907, was only eight, the population being 164,000. In comparing Cardiff, which had Sunday closing, with Newport, which had not Sunday closing, they had in the case of Cardiff, with a population of 187,000, 6 convictions, being 3 per 100,000; and in the case of Newport, without Sunday opening, and with a population of 75,000, they had 42 convictions, being 56 per 100,000. Therefore, the figures were strongly adverse to the case of his hon. friend, and strongly supported the case for Sunday closing, and its extension to Monmouthshire, which was his most important point. The hon. Member for Hackney had quoted one extract from one report of one chief constable, but it was usual in all political and statistical controversies to use just that one extract which suited one's purpose for the moment. He did not think the hon. Member would find in a succession of reports by chief constables of Monmouthshire anything to support his theory. They could always get one text to support almost any proposition. He was amazed the other day when an hon. Member threw at him a text from Solomon, whom he should never put forward as a temperance reformer. He quoted—

> "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and who is deceived thereby is not wise."

But it was the same Solomon who said—

> "I have drunk my wine with my milk—"

not by the way so very curious a combination as might appear to hon. Members, because he learned that the production of milk was very much dependent on the consumption of beer, because brewers' grains were the chief food of milch cows, and if there was not enough beer consumed there would not be enough grains to keep the cows to produce the milk to keep up the supply of temperance people. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Gravesend and the noble Lord the Member for Horsham had got hold of the figures for Glamorganshire. The population of that county was more than half the population of Wales, but if they were to differentiate between the nationalities of the different persons who were convicted of drunkenness, they would see that a large majority were not Welshmen, but strangers from England, Scotland, and Ireland and other foreign countries. The fact was well-known, and he hoped there would in future be some differentiation shown in order that this specious and plausible, but not tenable argument should not be brought forward against the well-known sobriety of Wales. The hon. Member also asked why Herefordshire and Shropshire were not equally entitled to be brought under this Act on the same ground as Monmouthshire. The connection between Monmouthshire and Wales however was of long standing. He had sometimes thought that in regard to Shropshire and part of his own constituency there was a close and intimate tie, and that certain people in Montgomeryshire might have been satisfied to be Salopians, if they had not attained the greater glory of being Welsh, but in regard to Wales and Monmouthshire the tie was of such a character that he did not believe anybody who was familiar with the subject would dream of claiming the same connection between any other county of England that there was between Monmouthshire and Wales. His own appreciation of Monmouthshire men extended to Monmouthshire landlords. The hon. and gallant Member for South Monmouthshire must have blushed when he criticised the class to which he belonged, but they had not been obstructed in the working of the Sunday closing sections in any part of Wales by the landlords, and they would not be in Monmouthshire. He believed indeed they would give a helping hand as the landlords of Wales had done. As to the six and three mile question, the hon. Member for Hackney had made the very obvious criticism that rich men would walk or motor round the section with the greatest ease, while the poor man could not. That was quite true and must apply to most sections of most Acts. The idea that any legislation would get round that difficulty was extremely hard to believe, nor could Labour Members who asked for special privileges for suffragettes in gaol desire to abolish class legislation. It seemed to him that there was some merit in having a six-mile limit—in fact he really agreed with the hon. Member for South Hackney. He thought it placed the man who had that Sunday walk which was so good for him on a superior footing to the mere saunterer who went out three miles, and for his part he would support the clause on that ground and not because he believed there was any very great harm in a man who had walked three miles getting a drink. But they must look at the clause rather in its rural aspect. They were not to consider Peckham and Balham and places like that so much as small country places where if there was a public-house three miles away from the town anyone could go there to drink, and many of the able-bodied population went. That was what this extension was intended to meet, and surely it was a proper provision which might fairly be supported, and approved upon the grounds put forward by the hon. Member for Hackney. His last word was that it was absolutely impossible to separate Monmouthshire from Wales.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said he ventured as a mere Englishman to intervene in the debate which was rapidly becoming merely a question of the treatment of one corner—he admitted a very distinguished corner—of the United Kingdom. He thought the last speaker would have been more convincing if instead of merely reading out a list of convictions for Sunday drunkenness he had been able to convince them that not only were there fewer convictions for drunkenness on Sunday, but also that the whole amount of drunkenness had materially diminished. The hon. Member might speak for his own part of the country, but he was not entitled to speak for England, and to describe as a normal condition such a state of things as this, that if a public-house in a rural district was open within three miles the whole able-bodied population walked off to drink.

*Mr. REES: I said it might come to be used in that way.

Mr. LANE-FOX said even the conception that that sort of thing might be the result showed how absolutely necessary it must be for his own part of the country to have the Sunday closing they had now got. But until something of that sort came more within the region of possibility in England they would be better advised to maintain the system they had at present. The Solicitor-General said the clause was simple. It was no doubt simple compared with many of the drafting efforts of the Government in this and other measures. But when they took it in connection with the other clauses recently adopted by the Government the whole position was altered. He would not go so far as to say that the Sabbatarian argument in the country or in that House was out of date, but to his mind there was only one possible argument in favour of Sunday closing and that was that it saved Sunday labour to people who badly needed it. If he were convinced that this clause was going materially to save Sunday labour it would be a strong argument for voting for it, but he failed to find there was a great decrease in Sunday labour under the Bill. There was no reason why a man should have any more right to get drunk on a week-day than on a Sunday, and in that respect there was no difference between Sunday and any other day. He did not know what other sound argument there could be for Sunday closing except the question of the day of rest. But what was going to happen? Under the new clause public-houses would have to be open through the whole of Sunday.

Sir S. EVANS: I must protest against that. Nothing of the sort. What we said was that no one need open his door. If he does open his door for the supply of meals only he is not guilty of an offence, but he can keep his door closed every hour and every minute of the day.

Mr. LANE-FOX said that if that was the position the Government were putting a very serious temptation in the way of inn-keepers to subject their employees to Sunday labour. It was only a matter of time and they would have all the evasions connected with this meal which were practised in other countries. He heard of a case the other day in which cheese cakes were made of plaster-of-Paris and handed round as a meal which the man who wished to have a drink was supposed to be enjoying. That went on satisfactorily for a time until one day a customer broke his tooth, and the inn-keeper had to pay compensation for damage. There was a very great reason for voting against the clause, in the fact that it was absolutely inoperative in preventing the very form of Sunday drunkenness which was very common and which was doing most harm—the question of the Sunday tripper who came in a cab. This Bill did nothing to prevent secret drinking in clubs. One hon. Member representing a Welsh constituency had spoken of the great evils which sprang upon Wales after Sunday closing was put into operation owing to the creation of drinking clubs. It was all very well for the hon. Member for Montgomery to tell the House that they were strangers who came into Wales to get drunk. The point they had to consider was that if they passed the Bill in its present form, and made it impossible for a man with a certain amount of means to obtain alcohol whilst the rich could get all they required, the result would be an enormous increase in the number of secret drinking clubs. For those reasons he was not prepared to support the clause.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) claimed that the majority of the working men's representatives in the House were in favour of Sunday closing not only in Wales and Monmouth but all over the country. That was because many of them, to quote the words of the Leader of the Opposition, had lived among the working classes and knew what they felt on this subject, and they, therefore, supported Sunday closing for the sake of the men they represented. He was speaking for Rhondda, and he claimed to know what they wanted better than any other man in that House. Some of them might say the "Old Man" was rather hard on them in asking for public-houses to be closed on Sundays, but he was sure that when on Monday morning they tried to rise to go to work and failed because of a bad head, they would say that the "Old Man" was right after all. Sunday was the only day of rest for the miners, the only day when they were not in the colliery, and he wanted them to spend their time at home with their families. He could draw pictures of the difference between the face of the Welsh valleys years ago and now. He represented a valley fourteen miles long. They talked about absentee landlordism in Ireland, there was a good deal of it in Wales. He spoke of things as they were, and he and his friends were pressing this matter in order to secure the comfort of the families of the men. There was no doubt that men lost more work on Monday than on any other day of the week. Three-fourths of these men were drunkards, and fond of drink, and if they increased the temptation for them to drink they would do so. He only wanted to place before the House what he knew. He was not speaking from the point of view of what hon. Members opposite called fanatics, nor even from the point of view of teetotalers; he was merely regarding the matter from the standpoint of the benefit of the men he represented.

EARL WINTERTON: Where do they get their drink now?

AN HON. MEMBER: From the clubs.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Well, close your clubs. If he had the opportunity of closing them he would. But that did not affect his argument. The man left his family; instead of taking his Sunday dinner at home with them, he went and got drunk; he lost Monday, and his ability to earn money was not as great on Tuesday as it should be, and it was Wednesday before the collieries were full again. The men who were losing work were the men who had a taste for drink. Reduce the temptation to these men to drink and they would extend their opportunities of increasing their earning power and of bringing in more wages for their families' enjoyment. He appealed to the House upon that point and that point alone to do what it could to remove this evil of temptation. He remembered his old mother being much put about on one occasion because the cat ate the candles. His sister came in, and when the old woman told her about the cat, she said: "Hang them up under the ceiling;" the cat could not get up there, and the candles were safe. The House should act similarly in removing the temptation to drink. He appealed to the House, if it could not see its way to decrease the facilities for drinking, not to increase them. If hon. Members wanted to see people sober and attentive to their work, if they wished to see them enjoying increased comfort in the bosom of their families, if they wished to make the country sober and peaceful, let them help to do away with the whole paraphernalia of drink-selling on Sunday.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said everyone agreed with the hon. Member as to the evils arising from drunkenness, and everyone desired that working men and others should keep sober not only on Sunday but on the other days of the week. No one shared that desire in a greater degree than himself. He recognised the sincerity of the hon. Member for Rhondda, but the difference between them was that he did not think this Bill would promote the object which the hon. Member desired. He did not think the hon. Member believed it would do so.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I believe with all my soul that it will.

SIR F. BANBURY said the hon. Member had admitted that the evil of drunkenness was intensified by clubs, and, replying to an interruption, he said he would close them all. The Bill did not close them, and it was for that reason he advanced the argument that the hon. Member would go very much further than the Bill. The hon. Member wanted total prohibition. Total prohibition to a certain extent would be a remedy. The cat that could not get the candle could not eat it, and so the man who could not get drink would not be able to get drunk. This Bill did not propose total prohibition. The question they were now discussing was whether licensed premises should be closed for a certain number of hours on Sunday. It was perfectly open for those who could not get beer at the time they wanted to buy it on Sunday to buy a bottle of whisky and take it home and drink it in their own house. There was nothing in the Bill to prevent that. The Solicitor-General had said that on the Committee stage the Government come to the conclusion from speeches made that it was the desire of Members in all parts of the House that London should be included in this clause. He wished to point out that there was no time for all the Members interested in London to speak. He supposed that the Government, having brought forward the clause exempting London, would stick to their guns. He thought the Government had brought forward the clause after due consideration, and that there was no need for any London Member to get up to support them on the matter. He was encouraged in that belief by a speech made by the Lord Advocate, or some other member of the Government, in which strong reasons were given why London should be exempted.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Lord-Advocate invited the opinions of the Committee.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had not *Hansard* with him, but if the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the reports of the debates he would find that a member of the Government made a speech in defence of the exemption of London from the clause. It was near the close of a debate that the Government announced their intention of making an alteration in the clause so as to include London. He was in the lobby at the time, and a friend came to him and said this alteration was going to be made. He had not time to make any protest on behalf of the City of London, which he had the honour to represent. It was quite true that the hon. Member for Sevenoaks said he could not vote for the clause unless London was included. He thought that in saying so his hon. friend made a mistake. The real conclusion which the Government should have deduced from that statement of his hon. friend was that there should be no alteration in the law at all. Sevenoaks would then have been in the same position as London in this matter. It was perfectly well known that the Royal Commission advocated the exemption of London, and the reason, of course, was evident to everyone. London was the centre of a great Empire, and it was absolutely necessary that foreigners should be attracted into the country. When they came here they should be allowed to enjoy themselves innocently, just as Englishmen did when they went to Paris and other parts of the world. That was the reason, he presumed, why the Royal Commission exempted London. He would be glad to hear from the Under-Secretary for the Home Department why the Government had thrown over the Royal Commission on this particular subject. In regard to the shortening of the hours in the country generally, he maintained that no reason had been advanced for it. The Solicitor-General did not give a single instance in which it had been proved that by shortening the hours for the sale of drink on Sunday any improvement had resulted.

SIR S. EVANS: I stated, rightly or wrongly—I think rightly—that general experience pointed to the conclusion that the restriction of the hours for selling drink had been a good thing.

SIR F. BANBURY said that that was the opinion of the hon. and learned Gentleman, but he had not brought forward any statistics to bear it out. Reference had been made to the good results attending Sunday closing in Ireland, but he would point out that there was a great difference between England and Ireland in this matter. The people of England drank beer, but the people of Ireland drank whisky. It was no hardship to the people of Ireland to close public-houses on Sunday, because they could buy whiskey in bottles and take it home. In England a man could not buy a barrel of beer and take it home, and, therefore, if he wanted a glass of beer he should be able to obtain it when he wanted it. Instead of having the effect of promoting temperance the clause would probably have the effect of causing beer drinkers to buy whisky to take to their homes for consumption on Sunday. The probability was that a man who did that would not go out on Sunday until he had finished the bottle of whisky. He would like the Solicitor-General to give the general statistics in regard to drunkenness in Ireland. He believed that these statistics showed that drunkenness in Ireland was as great as in England. If the proportion was the same, what became of the hon. and learned Gentleman's argument as to the good effects of Sunday closing in Ireland? Supposing for the sake of argument that the people of Ireland were made sober on Sunday but more drunken on Monday, what was the advantage of that? What they wanted to do was to make the people sober altogether. The hon. and learned Gentleman had made the startling statement that the Sunday Closing Act was included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, and that if anyone objected to it he could have prevented its passing by raising his hat. It was news to him that an Act could be struck out of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill by a Member's raising his hat. They knew perfectly well that they could do nothing of the sort. It was the hardest thing possible to get a law repealed unless the Government of the day did it, and it was sometimes difficult for them to do it. As regarded the question of Sunday closing in Monmouthshire, the hon. Gentleman told the House that Monmouth was divided from England by a beautiful river boundary and that the geographical reasons for including it in Wales were excellent. But why should a man be less sober or more drunken because he lived on the one side or the other of a beautiful river boundary? There was no logical conclusion to be drawn from that, and he could not see that there was anything at all in the argument. The Solicitor-General said that all the Members for Monmouthshire were in favour of Sunday closing. Of course they were, because they were returned by temperance people and temperance voters; but that was no argument that the whole of the people in the county were in favour of it too. As to the *bona fide* traveller part of the clause, he had not heard a single argument advanced by any speaker which went to show that the distance should be extended to six miles. He believed that this was an arrangement of the great democratic party in the State which would do harm to the poor but no harm to the rich. This great democratic party, which said that they were all in favour of the poor, allowed the rich man with his motor car or his carriage and pair to drive seven or eight miles for his refreshment, but compelled the poor man to walk twelve miles—six miles out and six miles back—for his. That was rather hard on the working man. He failed to see what earthly reason could be advanced by any temperance advocate—even by the right hon. Member for South Tyrone, who carried temperance on his face—in favour of this subsection. Could the right hon. Gentleman get up and give a reason why a walk of six miles was more likely to make a man sober than a walk of three miles—and if the greatest temperance orator in the House could show no reason for the extension of the distance from three to six miles, nobody else could do it. The fact was that there was a sort of idea about that if the limit was put very far people would not walk the distance. As a rule, if a man walked three miles on a hot Sunday afternoon he felt the need of a whisky and soda or a glass of beer. This was grandmotherly legislation run mad; and if it went on they would soon have legislation proposed to prevent a man going out for a walk of more than half a mile on a wet afternoon in case he caught a cold. He maintained that it was absolutely ludicrous for Parliament to go on with this kind of legislation when so many other more important social reforms were wanted. He hoped the House would reject the clause.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: This clause was discussed in Committee the whole of one day, and the speeches made to-day have not been dissimilar from those made against the clause on that occasion. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] Indeed, I do not know what is the object of this prolonged debate on the clause as a whole, unless it is to prevent the House reaching the various Amendments which are on the Paper. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!" and an HON. MEMBER: Your own side insisted in debating it."] But there is this difference from the previous debate, that in Committee we were favoured with no fewer than five speeches from the front Opposition bench, while to-day no right hon. Gentleman has risen from that quarter to address us. We then had a speech from the Leader of the Opposition which, the House will remember, was very sympathetic, couched in lofty tones, and by no means hostile to the clause as a whole, and it was followed by the striking fact that the right hon. Gentleman did not go into the lobby against the clause in the division, although he could not bring himself to vote in favour of any clause of this Bill. Then we had a speech from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer strongly in favour of the clause, and followed by a vote in the lobby in favour of it. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University also spoke and voted for it, while the Member for Sevenoaks, speaking from the front Opposition bench, criticised it in that it did not go far enough, and urged its extension to the Metropolis. Only one, the right hon. Member for Bordesley, denounced the clause and voted against it. It is painful to see the disunion on this matter in the ranks of hon. Members opposite. When the clause first came before the House we heard all these speeches from the leaders of the party in favour, or in sympathy with its principle; to-day not one speech on those lines has been made from the front Opposition bench, but the Opposition rank and file have been allowed to give full vent to their dislike of this part of the Bill. The noble Lord the Member for Horsham complained that the proposals of the Government regarding Sunday closing will throw the law into confusion. The other day the Member for York, who now cheers that remark, painted a picture of himself taking advantage of the various provisions of the law in order to remain in a London restaurant on Sunday and, by a judicious alternation of meals with alcohol and alcohol without meals, being enabled continuously to consume intoxicating liquors from midday until late at night, to be followed throughout the small hours of the morning by an orgie of soda water. The position of the law will be exceedingly simple, and will not give rise to confusion. The hours during which alcohol may be served with meals will be precisely the same as now. The law with respect to the sale of non-alcoholic liquors will be the same as now. The only alteration will be that the sale of alcohol without meals is reduced outside the Metropolis from six hours to three, and in London from seven hours to four. That, surely, is a proposition which ought not to tax the intellect of any person inside or outside the House. Hon. Members complain of the clause because they say it will be useless and will give rise to evasion, and in support of that they quote the case of Wales. The answer to that has been given by the hon. Member for South Hackney, who quoted the chief constable of Monmouthshire as saying that Sunday closing in Wales was the curse of Monmouthshire, because people flocked over the border to get drink. Why is it a curse to Monmouth if it is not that the people have to flock over the border to get the drink because they cannot get it in Wales? That completely answers the contention that Sunday closing in Wales cannot be enforced. Then we are told that if drinking clubs are allowed to remain open, the Sunday closing provisions with regard to public-houses will be useless. An hon. Member said, "Why not close the drinking clubs?" Undoubtedly they will be. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] It is the desire of the Government, and the provisions of this Bill will prevent drinking clubs remaining open. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] I say that under this Bill no club which is a drinking club can survive. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] That is unquestionably the purpose of the Government, and it will be the effect of the law. The club can and will be struck off the roll, and we have provided a system of inspection by which we can detect which clubs come within that category. Some evasion of Sunday closing laws there may be, as there is under any restrictive law. Hon. Members opposite seem to think that the evasion is the thing which is of importance, and that the intemperance which occurs under the existing law is of no importance. They say: "Let 100 men get drunk now with full facilities, it is an evil no doubt, but one with which we must bear; but if you restrict the sale of liquor and if in spite of restrictions ten men get drunk, that is a monstrous and intolerable abuse." Let us view these things in their due proportion. It will be seen that even if there is some slight evasion the good that is done by measures of this character will far outweigh the evil. The hon. Member for Hampstead says the clause might be acceptable if only we would pay compensation to the publicans whose business is restricted. Parliament has never adopted that course. We have had legislation for centuries restricting the hours of sale on week-days and the sale on Sundays, and never in a single instance have the restrictions been accompanied by any measure of compensation. When Sunday closing has been put into operation in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, no compensation has been given to the publican. Nor has any compensation been given for the shortening of the hours on which the public-houses are open for the sale of drink, and to attempt now to give compensation would be to depart from all precedents in regard to measures of this kind. We are challenged to say what reason of substance there is for extending the limit of the *bona fide* traveller from three miles to six. The reason is, because in our view the person who goes only three miles does not conform to the definition of *bona fide* traveller at all. A person who only goes three miles, especially in these days of trams and bicycles, is not thereby constituted a *bona fide* traveller. It is only by requiring a longer distance that you come to the class of persons who can properly be included in that category. I would point out to the noble Lord and to the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London that if this is absurd, grandmotherly legislation with no possible justification, they ought to be required to show why the majority of the Royal Commission, containing eight members of the liquor trade, signed recommendations analogous to our proposals. It is true that two of these representatives of the liquor trade dissented from all the Sunday closing proposals, and two others to the proposals as to hours alone, but as to the rest the majority of the Commission appended their signatures, The Majority Report says—

> "There is a strong local desire in Monmouthshire to be associated with Wales in the matter of Sunday closing."

And perhaps I may interpose here and say that it is not only the Radical members for Monmouthshire who are in favour of this proposal, but the county council and the councils of the neighbouring counties. The Commission go on—

> "We consider that this wish should be acceded to, especially as regards urban districts situated near the border. An important object is to get a border line where there is a sparse population, so that the special difficulties inseparable from the existence of different laws in adjoining localities may be reduced to the smallest compass."

Then in regard to Sunday hours of opening in England, the Commissioners say—

> "To enact complete Sunday closing throughout England would be, in our judgment, at the present time, a step too far in advance of public opinion. We are, however, prepared to recommend the further curtailment of the hours of opening to two hours at mid-day and two hours in the evening as a maximum. It would be advisable to leave London and the principal cities outside of the operation, at least for a time."

We have departed from the recommendation as to London by reducing the hours from seven hours to four. Then as to the *bona fide* traveller the Commissioners go on—

> "We consider that a limited number of licensed premises where travellers may be served at specified hours should be selected by the licensing authority, and that a special licence duty should be exacted in respect of this privilege. The statutory distance might be extended to six miles."

To all of those recommendations we have the signature of the majority of the Commission, with the exception of two members of the liquor trade and two other members of the liquor trade who dissented from the recommendation as to hours. But more important than those members who dissented, and carrying more weight in this House, is the assenting signature of the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs, who was a Royal Commissioner, who has taken a very active part in these discussions, and who, speaking with great knowledge on the subject, always commands the respect and attention of this House. He unfortunately is absent from our deliberations this afternoon, when this subject is under discussion, and strangely enough did not vote on this clause when it came on before. I am sorry he was not here in order that he might listen to the hon. Baronet for the City of London, denouncing the recommendation standing over his signature as "ridiculous grandmotherly legislation gone mad." If restrictions are of no use, and Sunday closing is preposterous and can only lead to evasion, why did the Royal Commission make the recommendations which I have quoted? My last point is this: the hon. Member who represents South Hackney has alluded to the Continent. He said there is an example to be followed. Do not look at Wales or Scotland or Ireland; go to France for a model, and follow their arrangements on Sunday.

MR. BOTTOMLEY; I did not say that, but I say it now.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: If I did not correctly represent what the hon. Member stated, at all events I represented what he thinks. That was at all events the purport of his argument. It is a remarkable fact that on the Continent at the present time the movement is all the other way. The last time I was in France I saw at Nice posters calling upon working men to attend a meeting in favour of "La Semaine Anglaise." They are anxious to give greater leisure to their workers.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): Including the police?

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: It would be far easier to give a weekly day of rest to the police if the public-houses were closed on Sundays. The Continent is becoming more anxious to secure on Sundays greater leisure for their workers and more repose to the community at large. It has been declared by Commission after Commission, Committee after Committee, that Sunday closing of public-houses is beneficial where is has been tried, and remembering that in the Committee stage this clause was confirmed by a majority of four to one, and received the approval of the majority of right hon. Gentlemen who spoke from the opposite front bench, I hope the House will not hesitate on this occasion to reaffirm that decision.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said it had been objected on their side that it was useless to shorten Sunday hours so long as clubs remained open, and the Under-Secretary said that under their legislation drinking clubs would not remain open. He thought that was a very fine distinction. Did the right hon. Gentleman deny that it would be possible for members of clubs, when this Bill was in operation, to get drink between eleven and twelve? If he did so, he ventured to say the distinction between a drinking club and a club in which drink could be obtained was so very fine and nice that it could only be characterised as sophistical. Upon the whole controversy between the Solicitor-General and the hon. Member for South Hackney he was bound to say he found himself for once in agreement with the hon. and learned Gentleman rather than with the hon. Member for South Hackney. He recognised that whether they took Sunday as an institution of divine or human origin, there must be some distinction between the hours of Sunday and weekday. That distinction had to be drawn in relation to the licensing trade as well as other businesses. He was bound to say that he was concerned, not so much with what happened during the hours in which the public-houses were open as during the hours in which they were nominally closed, and he must ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Government adhered to their view of the law stated on Friday last, that from one minute past twelve in the night to one minute to twelve on the following night, these premises might be open the whole of the day and night for the supply of refreshments, provided that during certain of those hours the refreshment supplied should not be of an alcoholic character. If they adhered to that view he did not know whether the Government had considered the position of ordinary refreshment houses. They would be placed at a disadvantage, as they were bound under the 11th Section of the Licensing Act of 1874, to close during the hours that public-houses were closed for the sale of intoxicating liquors. If the Government were right they had this extraordinary position, that premises on which alcohol was sold at certain times could be open at any hour of the day or night, and ordinary refreshment houses had to be closed at certain hours. He was told that the answer was that during the hours in which non-intoxicants were supplied the public-houses became refreshment houses, but he could find no legal warrant for that, because the definition of the latter referred to houses, shops, rooms or buildings, open for public entertainment—not being licensed for the sale of wine, etc. Therefore, they would have this position, and it seemed an extraordinary one to be brought about by a temperance Bill, that publicans would be induced to keep open nominally for the sale of non-intoxicants and food after closing hours but refreshment houses would be placed under a serious disability.

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said that the general sense of Scotland was that the Act passed about fifty years ago for Sunday closing had been a great blessing to the country, and there certainly was no class in Scotland that would like to see licensed houses open on Sunday. The general feeling was that the rest which the statute afforded was a great boon to the inn-keepers and publicans and their servants. It was almost impossible to conceive a Scottish brewer or distiller proposing that public-houses north of the Tweed should be open on the Sabbath; not that they loved their whisky less, but they loved Scotland more. Patriotic feeling and long experience confirmed their view. After listening to the hon. Member for South Hackney he wished to endorse the opinion of the hon. Member who had just sat down as to the extreme difference in the sentiment of the people towards Sunday and every other day of the week. He did not think it fair in discussing the Lord's Day and the traditional reverence with which religion had clothed it to use words like Sabbatarian implying something contemptuous or wrong. Presbyterians, Puritans, and Episcopalians agreed in this feeling. In England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, for century after century Sunday had been considered different from other days. If they were setting up a new Utopia would they propose that that day should be given to drink? He was sure they would not, and when they had a great reform like this before them, backed up by the figures and advice of all the Royal Commissions they had before them very strong arguments for cutting down the hours of Sunday drinking.

*MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said he took a slightly different view on this question from that held by a number of those with whom he was associated. In Committee he voted against the principle of this clause and he intended to be consistent and to vote for the Amendment before the House. He repudiated any allegation of being less desirous to promote temperance reform than the most zealous temperance reformer in the House, but he had never subscribed to the principle that a glass of beer on a Sunday was worse than a glass of beer any other day. Nor had he subscribed to the sabbatarian view, because he thought that all the days of the year should be regarded as the Lord's days.

His view was that the restrictions already in existence adequately sufficed to meet the question of temperance reform. Excessive drinking on any day of the week was to be deprecated. It militated against the worth of the workman as a workman and depreciated him as a citizen generally. He agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London that Parliament would have better spent its time in measures of another character than on a Bill of such complicated dimensions as the one on which they were engaged. He thought some of his friends approached this problem of temperance from the wrong standpoint. Drink was not always the tempter. It was often a monotonous life and sordid environment that sent people to drink. He thought this Parliamentary time would have been much better employed had it been devoted to measures which would have been more efficacious in finding an abiding solution of the unemployment problem and the improvement of the housing and general conditions of the people. He confessed that he himself, if he were compelled to live in some of the dwellings with which he was familiar, might go to the public-house and lay himself open to the strictures of the temperance reformers. With regard to the great solicitude for the workers of this particular trade he could not conceive that any provision of the Bill was going to restrict the hours of labour. The modifications made by the Government, in response to the demand to meet the case of London and other large centres, and their declaratory clause, proved that there was still a danger that the employees in this trade would be called upon to work excessive hours. The only abiding method of solving this problem was by generally restricting the hours of labour, not only in this but in other trades. When that problem came to be dealt with he sincerely hoped it would receive the support of those who were so strongly in favour of restricting the hours of the employees of this trade. He hoped that people in future would spend more time with their families. There was a growing disposition on the part of the workmen to take their wives and children out on a Sunday, and he did not think that Parliament would be justified in forcing people into a particular groove. Men could worship God as well in a country lane as in a conventicle. He had been enormously impressed with the fact that Continental workmen made a speciality on Sundays of taking their wives and families out with them to enjoy the Sunday in a rational fashion, and he believed it was not beyond possibility that the people in this country would do likewise. He did not believe that the six-mile limit would be very effective: given the desire to drink, and the means of purchasing it, he believed people would be able to overcome the difficulty of the extra three miles. As a temperance reformer, he looked for reform to come from within rather than from restrictive conditions applied from without. He could see a great improvement taking place in the lives of the working people, and he believed the surest way of temperance reform lay in giving the people certain employment and good remuneration and homes in which they could take genuine pride, thereby providing them with an attraction more powerful than the public-house. For all these reasons he was bound to dissent from the promoters of the Bill and vote for the Amendment.

Mr. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham) said he rose because up to the present not one of the London Members had got up to say how thankful they were to the Government for bringing London within the scope of the Bill. They were thankful that London was to be placed under the same conditions practically as other large cities. He wished the Government would have withdrawn the first Amendment on the Paper, and stuck only to the second. At the same time he would have been better pleased if they had withdrawn both.

*Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary had made some rather unjust and undeserved remarks on the comments from the Opposition. In the first part of his speech the right hon. Gentleman said that exactly the same arguments were being used now as were used in Committee, but on that occasion the speeches were being made from the front benches, and now they were being made from the back benches. So many speeches were made from the front benches in the Committee stage that those on the back were unable to say that which they wished to say. But on that occasion they were discussing, not this clause, but subsection (1) only. It was impossible to discuss in Committee the questions of the *bona-fide* traveller and of Monmouthshire. The question of Monmouthshire had been discussed to a certain extent on Clause 9, but if he remembered rightly the debate in Committee upon the present clause was confined exclusively to subsection (1). In the debate that afternoon attention had been mainly directed to subsections (2) and (3), which were not discussed at all in Committee. As to the absence of Members of the front Opposition bench, they had gone to South Wales and would have an opportunity of studying the question at close quarters. Another important point was that the whole situation, in their view, was changed by the utterances of the Prime Minister and Solicitor-General as to the obligation of innkeepers to serve non-alcoholic refreshments after closing time and on Sundays. It was said that the law had always been so, but that was not the view taken by licence-holders themselves. The greatest possible confusion had been caused by the Prime Minister's interpretation of the law. It was a new situation created since the discussion in Committee. A new point which he wished the right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury bench to deal with was as to whether the licence-holders in Monmouthshire, who were to be for the first time subject to Sunday closing, would get remission for a seventh part of the duty. According to what he read in the Bill, they would not, but surely that would be unjust. In Clause 20, subsection (3), if a house was closed on Sundays by the justices, as one of the conditions which they had power to impose, the licensee would get the benefit of Section 49 of the Act of 1872, and would only pay six-sevenths of the duty. It might be said that the case could be met by the licensees of Monmouthshire taking out a six-days licence. But that was not so. If a licensee in Monmouthshire took out a six-days licence, he would not be able to serve a *bona fide* traveller on Sunday at all. It was clearly not intended to prevent the *bona fide* traveller in Monmouthshire from getting refreshments on Sunday, and this point really deserved the attention of Ministers. A great injustice would be inflicted on the licence-holders in Monmouthshire unless the Government took some steps to remedy this defect. Possibly they could promise that it would be done suitably in another place, as had been promised in one or two other cases.

*MR. McCALLUM (Paisley) said he heartily supported this clause. Scotland had been so often referred to in the course of the debate as a benighted country, that possibly he might be able to give them some of his personal experience in regard to Sunday closing there. It was the custom years ago for Glasgow visitors to go to Paisley every Sunday, frequently as many as 600 or 700 arriving there merely for the purpose of drinking. The whole community was annoyed by this nuisance. There were two hotels which had the seven days licence, and where these visitors could get drink. Seven years ago the magistrates decided to give them only a six days licence, with the result that the people were enabled to go about their ordinary business, and after this experience of Sunday closing he was sure that 90 per cent. of the inhabitants of Paisley would uphold the policy adopted by the magistrates. Two private clubs were started, and they had a great deal of drunkenness in consequence on the Monday mornings. The magistrates again set themselves to work to put down this drinking, and on men found drunk on the Monday morning they inflicted fines of £2 or a month's imprisonment, so succeeding in killing both these clubs in a couple of months. The liquor which was supplied was bad and had a most vitiating effect on the men who partook of it, but since those clubs had been abolished, he was sure that the people of Paisley would not desire to go back to the old system. He gave this instance because he thought that if they had a strong and healthy public opinion behind the magistrates in dealing with this matter they would achieve the same excellent results elsewhere.

Mr. LANE-FOX: Is this six miles from Glasgow?

Mr. McCALLUM: It is seven miles.

Mr. LANE-FOX: A case of that kind is not touched by the Bill in England.

Mr. McCALLUM said the argument was the same. The difference between three miles and six only meant that a man who travelled six or seven miles might be thirstier than if he only travelled three miles. He thought that an ounce of experience was better than a ton of philosophy, and he was sure that if hon. Members had a little experience such as he possessed they would be disposed to look upon this Sunday closing as an actual necessity in the age in which they lived. He was not going into the Sabbatarian question, though he thought it was perfectly germane so long as they had an Established Church and held religious views. He, however, looked at this question from the humane point of view, and if in London they had every library, museum and picture gallery open on the Sunday and the public-houses closed, he was certain that they would soon all be the better for it. He protested against the tone of some hon. Members who referred to those who supported Sunday closing as fanatics and so forth. Medical science had demonstrated that the man who did not drink and led a pure life lived longer than those who drank. Further, the insurance returns showed that the man who did not drink got his life policy for 5 per cent. less. Surely hon. Members should be tolerant of those who were abstainers as well as of those who thought it wise to take drink, and he must again protest against the tone which had been adopted by some hon. Members in the course of the debate.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he wished to reply to the Under-Secretary who had taunted them because the front Opposition bench was not occupied. The absence of right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Gentlemen from the front Opposition bench was due to the fact that they were fulfilling an engagement in Wales which had been fixed long before this stage of the Bill was put down. He could assure the House that no one more than they regretted their absence on this occasion, but it was due to the unfortunate clashing of two events on that particular day. Otherwise, they would have been present to answer the right hon. Gentleman. ["Do it now."] Well, he would deal with the case of the hon. Member for Sevenoaks first. What the hon. Member for the Sevenoaks division said was that if the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that he really meant to deal with clubs in a proper manner he would vote in support of the subsection for Sunday closing, but that it was absolutely futile, or words to that effect, to vote for Sunday closing if clubs were not adequately dealt with. The right hon. Gentleman when he spoke was unable to give such an assurance with respect to clubs, and he quite frankly said that the question must stand over. That being so the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sevenoaks voted against the subsection as well as against the clause itself. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University had made equally strong remarks on the question of clubs, and he referred to the opinion of Prebendary Carlile that there was worse and more vicious drinking going on in clubs than in the public-houses of London on a Sunday. The right hon. Gentleman, if he was dealing with what the two hon. Members said, must remember that the support which they promised was conditional upon a proper dealing with clubs, which they held should be placed on the same basis as public-houses. He confessed that he himself was in great difficulty with reference to the subsection, and he had abstained from voting one way or the other because of that difficulty. Personally he admitted at once that he had what many Members would call Sabbatarian crotchets, and that he sympathised with Sabbatarianism. He felt strongly that as far as London was concerned if they passed this legislation in respect to public-houses when they had clubs which were affiliated to a thousand other clubs, a very large number of which would be in the Metropolitan area, they would be going through a farce in closing public-houses, and one felt that if they were really dealing with a temperance matter of this kind they were simply causing annoyance and inconvenience to a large number of people, and really not going to the root of the matter at all. He had always had grave doubts whether they could enforce temperance by Act of Parliament, but assuming they were prepared to impose greater restrictions in that way, with the present state of the clubs it was a mere farce to deal with one part of the matter, the public-houses, without dealing with the clubs at the same time. For that reason he thought the condition made by the hon. Member for Sevenoaks was perfectly fair. The question of the six-mile limit was a very difficult one. Whether or not it was any use to pass such a section as this in a piecemeal way he had the greatest possible doubts. Though he did not wish to vote against the subsection he felt that no one could vote for it without feeling that it did not deal really with the difficulty in large towns such as London. If it was really causing inconvenience to people who wanted to drink they would find clubs springing up at every turn. For that reason, he could not support the clause, though he did not propose to vote against it.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) said he should not have risen but for the fact that they had had no answer to the question raised by the hon. Member for Sheffield. It was an extremely important point that under certain circumstances refreshment houses would have to be closed whilst licensed premises, although not entitled to sell liquor, would be entitled to sell refreshments, and the refreshment houses would be placed in an extremely disadvantageous position. He did not know that there was any answer to that. He could not believe it was the object of the majority opposite to strike this blow at refreshment rooms and give this benefit to licensed premises. They had not at present to supply refreshments, and he thought it was highly probable that when it became extended, although they might not supply liquor, they would be compelled to supply refreshments to *bona fide* applicants—food and possibly temperance drinks. It would under these circumstances be the very gravest hardship on properly licensed refreshment rooms that they also should not be entitled to provide refreshments as they and their customers might wish. With regard to the *bona fide* traveller, why was this attack made upon walkers instead of upon those who went in trams and buses? He was fond of walking and many a day he had had a walk of the kind they would now have to extend to six miles. He had gone four or five miles, and he honestly confessed he wanted a drink and a biscuit, and he had had it. He had walked four or five miles and had got home in a reasonable time. But under this proposal it would be absolutely impossible to do it. Those who went in trams and motor-cars might do their six miles and get their drinks, but pedestrians, who ought to be encouraged in every way, could not be expected to go six miles before they could get a drink. He should be glad to know whether the Member for Battersea always went six miles on a Sunday morning. He would certainly require refreshment before doing twelve miles. With regard to Monmouthshire, why should this attack be made on the Forest of Dean, and on Gloucestershire? That was what it really was. They found in Monmouthshire the constables objected to the closing because the people came over the border. If they included Monmouthshire the same thing must happen with the next counties. They would then have the constables of the Forest of Dean complaining, and he had not the slightest doubt that the county would suffer from the clause. The clauses relating to Sunday closing in restaurants in London were in absolute chaos.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 256; Noes, 71. (Division List No. 393.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)

Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esselmont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh

Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallett, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.

Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)

Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Collings,Rt Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James (Down,E.)
Dixon-Hartland,Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Percy, Earl
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W.W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marlyebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Fell.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, lines 4 and 5, to leave out the words 'one hour,' and to insert the words 'three hours.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said this was a question which he raised on the Committee stage, and he desired to raise it again. This Amendment would enable a bench of magistrates to fix the three opening hours between noon and three o'clock. The Solicitor-General said that the provision was intended to suit watering places where it was desirable that the opening hours should be close together in the afternoon and where evening opening was not required. It appeared to him that the proposal opened the door to something very much more extreme, and would go entirely beyond the recommendations of the Report which he had signed, as some benches might take advantage of it not to open at all at night. For those reasons he should be obliged to vote against the Amendment unless some words were inserted which would prevent the case he had mentioned from happening.

Sir S. EVANS: It is quite true that if my Amendment is adopted the justices in any particular place can fix the three hours in the afternoon any time between noon and ten o'clock at night. We think that this elasticity is advantageous, and we do not think it is likely to be abused. It might be extremely convenient to a particular locality to have two hours or even three hours in the early afternoon in watering places which might not desire to open after five or six o'clock. In those cases it might also be advantageous to the public who have to be served. Of course, it is not an inflexible rule, and we think it is a matter which it is quite safe to leave to the discretion of the justices. That is why the Amendment has been proposed.

*MR. G. D. FABER (York) said he had altered his opinion upon this matter. When the clause was first brought in it provided that there should be one hour between noon and 3 p.m., and any two hours between 6 and 10 p.m. Now it was proposed that the first hour should be between 12 and 3 p.m., but the other two hours should be at any time the licensing justices cared to fix. He had at first thought this favoured elasticity, but if it happened to be a teetotal bench who did not favour drinking at a later hour they could fix the whole of the three hours between 12 and 3 in the afternoon, and the public-houses in that district would be entirely shut to the inconvenience of the majority during all the rest of the hours of Sunday. That was the reason why he had altered his mind on this point, and he hoped his hon. friend would divide the House upon this Amendment.

Question put, "That the words 'one hour' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 79; Noes, 288. (Division List No. 394.)

AYES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Percy, Earl
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J.T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.

Sir S. Evans.

Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, HerbertJ. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery, Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, SirW. Howell (Bristol, S
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. HerbertJohn
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. SirW. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, RobertV. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Harmsworth, CecilB. (Worc'r)
Harvey, W.E. (Derbys're, N.E.)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner

Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn. A.C. (Kincard.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncas'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)

Price, SirRobertJ. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, SirCharlesEdw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, DavidAlfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)

White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Proposed words inserted in the Bill.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 5, to leave out the words '3 p.m., and for any two hours between 6 p.m. and.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 285; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 395.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George

King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B’ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, Sir George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C. (Kincard
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast’r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O’Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S’thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E. (Edinb’gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm’th
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh’mpt’n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberston,Sir G.Scott(Bradf’rd
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E. (Clackman’an
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart’nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth’n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J. W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Clynes, J. R.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness,Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Harwood, George
Hills, J. W.
Hope,JamesFitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee,ArthurH. (Hants,Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A. R.
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nolan, Joseph

Oddy, John James
O'Grady, J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winterton, Earl
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, line 7, at the end, to insert the words 'subject to the condition that one of the hours so fixed must be between noon and 3 p.m. Provided that, in the application of this provision to premises in the Metropolitan district, four hours shall be substituted for three hours and 11 p.m. shall be substituted for 10 p.m.' "—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 294; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 396.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J.T (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.

Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C (Kincard.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Willams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wison, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel

Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker,Col. W. H.(Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 13, to leave out lines 12 and 13."—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 283 ; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 397.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,JosephA. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex, Rom'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,SirT. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Halsam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.

Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffold, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price,SirRobertJ.(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton-under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,SirCharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CaptainJames(Down, E.
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch,HenryCubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R.(Haggerston
Guinness,W.E.(Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope,JamesFitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,F. E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker,Col.W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said he rose to move the omission of Clause 20 on the broad ground that powers so wide were sought to be conferred by it on the licensing justices that they were altogether an exaggeration of the necessities of the case. They had been discussing at great length the whole of the licensing law, the position of licence-holders, the position of the justices of the peace, and the position of the State in regard to immediate control and future acquisition of the monopoly value and the rest, and he submitted that having laid down certain principles with regard to all those matters it should not be within the power of the licensing justices at their discretion to make fresh changes in the law after the general law had been laid down. If Parliamentary control was worth anything in these matters, it ought not to be at the discretion of the licensing justices to review the decisions of Parliament and upset them. And he would point out, that the extension of these powers was only in one direction. The justices in many ways had their discretion severely limited. They were told that they were to reduce the number of licences according to a scheme and their proceedings were severely hampered by the Licensing Commission. They had no power to extend the number of houses, but under this clause they had powers given them still further to harry and harass the licensed trade in many particulars. In the 1904 debates they heard a great deal of the discretion of the justices, and if that was to be a real discretion, if they were to trust them from first to last, they ought to trust them in more than one direction. They ought not to trust them in one direction and limit their freedom and their powers in another. They found that the licensing justices had no discretion to make things more tolerable for the licensed trade by the powers given them, but they were still more severely and drastically to extend the law against the licensed trade and all those concerned in it. He thought he could prove that by going very shortly through the various extra powers that had been conferred upon them. In the first place they might attach to the renewal of an on-licence any condition as to the arrangement of the premises open to the public. That was a fair provision if only applied to new licences, but it would be applied to all licences, even during the reduction period. It was in the power of the justices under subsection (*a*) to put the licence owners or holders of licensed property to very great and uncertain expense. They would not know from one year to another what conditions would be imposed. They might be required to make all sorts of structural alterations, to put up expensive plate glass partitions, and, in fine, to transform their houses. It was the uncertainty he complained of. It was said that if the members of the licensed trade had a certain number of years to put their affairs in order they would be able to make arrangements and be safe at the end of a given time. They knew that was not so in regard to other parts of the Bill, because they might be disturbed by local option or other conditions, and even during the fourteen years they would be at the mercy of the local justices in so far as they might be required to alter their premises to any extent, and that was to put a new and unfair burden upon them. This clause was by no means necessary from the point of view of the main structure of the Bill, which was to give fourteen years for a reduction period and a further seven years during which the houses might remain. The clause introduced a new element of uncertainty to all licence-holders. What he had said with regard to sub-head (*a*) was true of sub-head (*b*) which dealt with the access to the premises. Here was another great vista of possible expense and inconvenience to be thrown upon the licensed trade. Then as to the supply of greater measure, or what was known as the long pull, with the technicalities of which he was not acquainted. It would be easy to evade because if certain customers required a longer pull they could be met by a reduction in the price instead of by increase of liquor. Section (*d*) gave a power to the magistrates which if exercised would make the boundary question perfectly intolerable. Different licensing authorties might have different hours for closing on Sunday, and people living near the boundary would, by crossing it, be able to get what they wanted.

The result would be that the licence-holders on one side of the boundary would be penalised, whilst those on the other would be enriched. Monmouth was to be included in the Sunday closing provision, because of the effect in the county of Sunday closing in Wales. Directly Monmouth had been included it would be found necessary to extend Sunday closing to the Forest of Dean, because of the very evil which was now complained of in Monmouth. What took place now with regard to Glamorganshire and Monmouth would then take place with regard to Monmouth and the counties which bordered it, and the difficulty would be much increased. It should not be in the power of licensing justices to upset the result of Parliamentary deliberations, which they would do if this discretion was allowed them. Subsection (*e*) also could lead to nothing but local confusion. He did not understand how that provision was to be applied. The licensing justices might have different views as to the *bona fide* traveller. The limit of the distance might be different in adjoining areas, and a man having walked six miles might be met with a refusal on the ground that the justices had extended the limit to ten miles. There would be the utmost confusion from a variety of practice. Surely what Parliament had rightly or wrongly decided ought not to be disturbed by the caprice of magistrates in various districts by local justices. The same argument applied to the next section which related to the closing of licensed premises on election days. At present the view held was that if an election took place in any part of England or Wales, no public-house could be kept open in any place throughout the country. That was not the intention of the Government, and the wording must be amended, but there again would crop up the boundary difficulty, and if the justices stopped the sale of liquor in one district a rush would be made to the adjoining districts. The penalty to be imposed for default in complying with any of the justices' conditions he regarded as immoderate. Surely it ought to be sufficient to impose a fine where a man had made a small slip, such as serving a traveller who had only come five miles instead of six or serving a person on a polling day, and the licence should not be taken away unless the offence were repeated after full warning had been given. On the grounds that he had stated, he begged to move to omit Clause 20.

*MR. YOUNGER in seconding the Amendment, said the policy of the clause was extremely objectionable. He was one of those who had considered this question of the restrictions of the licensing laws for a long period—over four years—and it had been borne in upon his mind rightly or wrongly that the licensing laws ought to be consistent and uniform throughout the country. It would not be either desirable or wise to have districts contiguous to each other under different regulations. In a matter of this importance people ought to know what the law was to realise when they were breaking it; and, moreover, those carrying on an extremely difficult trade should not be asked to face unnecessary difficulties. There should be consistency in both administration and law, as had been prescribed in the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Unless there was some occult reason, of which he was not aware, it was unnecessary to deal with the arrangements relating to the premises and the access thereto, because the Act of 1902 provided that no alteration upon them could be made without the sanction of the justices. Subsection (*c*) dealing with the "long pull" was almost comical, because it applied entirely to on-licences, while it was chiefly in off-licensed premises, to which the section did not apply, that the "long pull" was observed. After all, what was a long pull? He had no personal experience, but he was informed that the long pull really consisted of the addition of some extremely light non-intoxicating beer to a stronger liquor. The publican filled up the measure with a draft of this light beer—lighter even than that stone ginger-beer which the hon. Gentleman opposite the Member for Appleby affected. Why should not a man have his stronger drink diluted with a weaker if he chose in the same way that a man diluted his whisky with soda water? Perhaps the Solicitor-General would tell the House that.

SIR S. EVANS: It is the licensed victuallers who have asked for this subsection.

*MR. YOUNGER said that might be. He did not object to that, what he objected to was the comical character of the Bill. He might remind the House that they were dealing now with a strictly free trade Government, and it seemed rather hard in them to prevent a man getting greater value for his money if he could. It was not consistent with the free trade principles which hon. Members opposite professed on platforms and in the House. The power to place further restrictions upon Sunday opening and to select various houses which might be entirely prohibited from opening on Sunday seemed somewhat drastic, and he did not think it was at all satisfactory. The Bill had gone considerably beyond the recommendations of the Majority Report with respect to Sunday opening. He understood that during his absence in the afternoon the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary noticed the fact that he had not voted in the division on the Sunday closing clause, and that he was not in his place to deal with the matter. He had, however, dealt with the subject once or twice during the Committee stage, and he did not in the least recede from what he had said on those occasions. He then said that a reasonable modification of the hours of Sunday opening was desirable, but he reminded the right hon. Gentleman that the Government had gone a good deal further in the matter than he or the Commission was of opinion they ought to go, and while he could not vote against the proposal he did not vote for it. He had gone no further than to say he thought it was desirable there should be some modification. He did not see anything very occult about that; it seemed very obvious, and certainly he did not in any way recede from the position he then took up.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I did not refer to the hon. Member with the view of accusing him of inconsistency. I merely called in aid his authority to support the general policy of our clause.

*MR. YOUNGER said he came prepared to give the Government what assistance he could, and was perfectly willing to afford it if the right hon. Gentleman had not already sat down. The *bona fide* traveller clause was likely to create some difficulty, and it certainly also appeared to be a very drastic thing to give the magistrates power to close the public-houses in connection with what he might call local elections. They were continually having small local elections nowadays, in which very few people took interest, frequently only referring to the newspapers the next morning to see who had got in. To say that those elections should give a further opportunity for restricting people from a perfectly natural and proper indulgence, in what after all was harmless, so long as it was kept in its place, seemed to him to draw the line so ridiculously stringently as to make this clause in that respect an insult to the electors themselves. It was ridiculous to suppose that a man was not able to say that A or B should be his county councillor without the public-houses being closed. He had never seen anybody very excited over county council elections, except perhaps in London, where they were more or less political. All this restrictive policy, and all these dictatorial legislative powers which were being given to magistrates, were another nail in the coffin of those who desired to see real public-house reform. Those restrictions must inevitably tend to degrade the public-house and convert it into a mere drinking place for adults. They did not permit any kind of innocent attraction or any kind of assimilation of our public-houses to the class of cafés they had in France, which were harmless places, and which he was sure most of them would like to see established in this country. He believed the whole administration of the licensing laws of Great Britain had been a stupid administration. He believed that if, instead of placing restrictions upon the publicans, instead of converting these houses into mere drinking bars, they had taken an enlightened view and encouraged licensed publicans so to change their mode of carrying on business as to offer the attractions in their houses which clubs offered and under strict regulations, they would not have the difficulties which they experienced to-day, and they probably would not have had this Bill except in its financial aspect, because it would have been wholly unnecessary. He protested against the constant efforts of the Legislature to make more and more impossible the establishment in this country of the class of house to which he had referred. The hon. Member for the Tradeston division of Glasgow had said he should be glad to see places where they supplied intoxicating drinks to the ordinary workman made respectable only and not respected. If they had had cafés like those in France established in this country long ago they would have created a different state of matters in our cities from that which they found to-day. Long ago they would have seen men and their wives and families going into those places, and getting whatever sort of refreshment they wanted—tea, coffee, and even the stone-bottled ginger beer that his hon. friend affected, with 2 or 3 per cent. of alcohol in it. They would then have had respectability and respect also. That was what they ought to strive for, and not by this continuous restriction do everything they could to discredit the public-house, making it a mere drinking bar. It was because this clause contributed to that unfortunate result that he strongly objected to it and should vote against it, and also because, in his judgment, they should not place legislative powers of this kind in the hands of the local bench. Parliament ought to have the courage to say itself what ought to be the law. It ought not in a cowardly way to delegate its own authority and responsibility to others. The law, if it was to be properly administered, must be thoroughly understood, must be consistent, and generally applicable throughout the kingdom. He begged to second.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 12, to leave out Clause 20."—(*Mr. James Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'arrangements,' in page 14, line 15, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. GOOCH (Bath) said that those who sat on the Ministerial benches regarded Clause 20 as one of the most valuable clauses in the Bill. He certainly regarded each one of the subsections as well worthy a place in any licensing or temperance reform Bill. Valuable as the clause was as it stood, he congratulated the Government on proposing to make it still more valuable, by putting down an Amendment, as the Solicitor-General had done, to give local authorities the power to prevent the opening of licensed premises before eight o'clock in the morning. He could not imagine that any exception could be taken to that proposal in any quarter of the House. But while congratulating the Government, he expressed his great regret that they had not seen their way to go a little further and carry out another part of the recommendations of the Minority Report of the Royal Commission, viz., that which had reference to earlier closing in the evening. The hon. Member for Ayr Burghs had said with perfect truth that the Majority Report did not look favourably on local discretion to close earlier in the evening, but it did recommend earlier closing on the Saturday evening in Ireland—where, he was glad to know, it had been carried out—while as regarded England and Wales, the Commissioners said they would welcome some further curtailment, but they did not think public opinion was ripe for it. He did not think that looked as if they objected to some further curtailment. Having regard to the fact that the Majority Report had been referred to, he thought it only right that some reference to the Minority Report should be made on the Ministerialist Benches, and he thought he was right in saying that on no subject of practical temperance reform did the Minority Report take a stronger view than in reference to earlier closing of public-houses. They suggested that public-houses should not be opened before seven and eight, and most strongly recommended that discretion should be given to close not one hour earlier in the evening but actually two hours earlier. It was suggested that in cases where this was done it should only be done by way of experiment for one year, so that if it did not succeed it could be withdrawn. In London, public-houses were open every day in the week except Saturday and Sunday until half-an-hour after midnight. It seemed extraordinary that in this comprehensive measure there should be no reference to that point. He hoped very much, if the Bill was discussed in another place, that some friend of temperance would suggest an Amendment in favour of closing earlier in the evenings.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member as far as I understand, is addressing himself rather to an Amendment of the clause. The question I have to put is that the clause stand part. If he is speaking, as I think he is, on a suggested Amendment to the clause, he ought to wait until he gets to the Amendment.

MR. G. GOOCH: I think I have expressed what I desire to say.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said that to anyone who had really taken the trouble to study the question without any prejudice on the one side in favour of teetotal principles, and without any pecuniary or other interest on the other hand, this clause would certainly present itself as being, perhaps, the most objectionable in the whole Bill. It simply gave a discretionary power to the justices to attach conditions to the renewal of any licence—not the whole of the licences in their district, but any one or more licences, and it would not be incumbent on them to attach the same set of conditions to all the houses. They might attach any kind of condition to one house, and another condition to another. They might attach conditions in respect to a certain number of defined points, which were set out in detail in the clause. This was practically inviting different benches of magistrates to behave in a capricious manner. They might single out certain licensees or certain portions of the district for differential treatment. They had had cases where, in the opinion, at all events, of unprejudiced people, various benches in different parts of the country had acted unfairly, and it seemed to him that this tremendous discretionary power which was sought to be given by this clause, would enable any such bench to act even more unfairly in the future than they had done in the past. There was practically no safeguard, with the exception of the clause about appeal, which was the same thing as the law to-day on the subject, against the annoyance and the difficulty which a bench of magistrates might cause to any given licensee. They had to look at the different matters in respect of which these conditions might be imposed, and the first of them was the arrangement of any part of the premises open to the public. He knew of a number of cases where magistrates had acted upon this proposed power. They had already made conditions with regard to the arrangement of the premises, and it had had the effect of imposing some most objectionable restrictions, which had resulted in certain definite evils, and the invitation which was held out by the clause to magistrates to impose further restrictions would only have the effect of increasing and accentuating those evils. The effect had been in a number of cases that the licensed house had ended in being merely a bar or a couple of bars. Everything else in the way of accommodation to the public had been swept out. When the licensee had applied, as he had done over and over again, for facilities for slightly extending the premises or doing something to accommodate the business, he had been refused. Conditions had been imposed upon him and not a single inch could he get towards increasing the number of square feet in which the sale of drink was allowed, and all kinds of structural alterations for which he had asked permission were refused, and various other structural alterations had been imposed upon him. There was no other business in the world, and no other country in the world, where any authority had a right or proposed to exercise the right of interfering with any business in this extraordinary, detailed, irritating and arbitrary manner. In a large number of cases there were no chairs or tables, and they could not get those facilities. The ventilation in many places was simply abominable. The general effect was to make the houses disreputable, uncomfortable, and unrespectable as far as it could possibly be so made. There were a number of perfectly honest but prejudiced men, some of them Members of that House, who would desire to make a licensed house as inconvenient, unrespectable, dirty, and ill-ventilated as they possibly could, because they wanted to bring the public-house into disrepute, to harry the brewer in every possible way, and to make it as inconvenient and disreputable as possible for a person to go into a licensed house. They did not hesitate to avow that they did not want these places to exist, but wanted them to become so that they were bound to be closed in deference to public opinion. They wanted to make them impossible. They had succeeded, unfortunately—the Legislature and the benches of magistrates between them—to a very large extent, in carrying out this extraordinary course, particularly during the last twenty years, and the result had been that a large number of the houses were becoming practically impossible. He knew cases where, owing to restrictions imposed by magistrates and reasonable facilities refused, it had been impossible to make the sanitary arrangements adequate. When they carried the thing to that length he thought it would be admitted by every reasonable person who tried to take an unprejudiced view of the question that to allow restrictions of this kind to be made at the mere caprice of benches was very objectionable. The effect of enabling the magistrates to impose these conditions had been to some extent, and would be in the future, to make it impossible to get what he believed all sections of the community would like to see, namely, something approximating to the Continental café. What was wanted was not so much to put an end to places where a man could get some intoxicating liquor, but to try and make those places respectable and decent, where a man would behave in a respectable way. Games were forbidden in nine licensed houses out of ten, and even if they were allowed there was no space in which they could be played. It used to be said, and many people quoted it with great fervour: "Shall I not take mine ease at mine inn?" Owing to the way in which the Legislature and the magistrates had treated them, how many inns were left where it was possible for any decent person to go and take his ease? Sub-clause (*b*) was: "Any access to the premises." That had nothing to do with passages and so on, but with doors. The bench of magistrates in Liverpool set to work a few years ago to make it a condition that certain licensed houses should close their back doors. He believed it was generally conceded that that was a good thing. It helped to put an end to surreptitious and illegal drinking. If it had been imposed as a general law on the whole of the licences, there would not have been anything really to be said against it, but—and this was an illustration of what would happen with regard to subsection (*b*)—a considerable number of licensed houses were picked out, and they were told that unless they closed their back doors their licences would be refused. Others were allowed to continue with their back doors open, and this had gone on for years. Some restaurants in the centre of the City which were situated in the basements of blocks of offices and had access to the streets, and from the well of the staircase, and from the open courts, where there were other offices behind, were ordered to close all their doors except one, and some of them were left alone with doors all round. This was a kind of thing which was put in hand with a perfectly good motive, but which had caused the greatest possible annoyance because of the unfairness and partiality of its application. That was the reason why he objected to the insertion of a power relating to a matter of this sort as a mere discretion vested in justices. The next section dealt with stopping the long measure. A good deal had been said about the "long pull." In practice, so far as it had come under his own personal knowledge, the long pull was this: a man who did not want to go to a licensed house and desired to obtain supper beer would send his servant with a jug to the public-house, and the practice in certain districts had been to give very nearly double, or at least one and a half times as much as the quantity ordered for the same money. Instead of getting one pint in the jug they would get one-and-a-half pints, and instead of getting one quart by the long pull they would probably get a quart and a pint. It was now proposed to put an end to that practice. It was a fact that nobody over the counter ever got the long measure, and that was not the complaint. The position was that the man who did not want to use the public-house amenities and spend twenty minutes over a glass of beer would send his servant with a jug to get the long measure, and this was to be rendered illegal by giving the magistrates power to put an end to it. Why should the man who desired to be put on wholesale terms not be allowed to obtain that advantage? He confessed that he could not see any equitable reason why an acknowledged practice of that sort, where the beer was taken away and consumed off the premises at a meal, should be interfered with. This particular practice was very common in connection with the meals of the working people, and why should they not be able to get beer in this way and upon those terms if the publican chose to supply it? Subsection (*d*) gave power to stop the sale of intoxicating liquors during the whole of Sunday, and it was to be illegal during certain hours. This was an instance in which one had again to consult personal experience. He was not sufficiently well off to own a motor car; he took his vacation holidays on a bicycle, and he had been in the habit of doing so for many years. Why should he be incommoded by the caprice of any bench of magistrates in any particular district owing to some arrangements they had made, as a consequence of which he might find himself in a place where the licensed houses were closed and he could not get any refreshment. He did not think this was either fair or reasonable. It seemed to him that if it was intended strictly to limit the hours on Sunday it ought to be carried out uniformly all over the country in the same way. Under this subsection magistrates might make it impossible for him to get his meal in one district between twelve and one o'clock. On going to the next district he might find public-houses closed there from one to two o'clock, and then he might have the misfortune to run into a place where they were closed from two to three o'clock. He might run through the country in such a way that during the whole of Sunday he might not be able to get anything to eat or drink. He understood that it was not competent for them to say anything about the clause which the Government proposed to introduce with regard to selling before 8 a.m. He noticed that there was an Amendment upon the Paper by the Government to introduce between subsections (*d*) and (*e*) a restriction giving the magistrates power to make any house shut up prior to eight o'clock. He was afraid, however, he would not be in order in discussing that point.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Strictly speaking, that is so; but as it is a Government Amendment I shall not offer any objection.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he supposed that the majority of the magistrates were not up before eight o'clock in the morning, and they did not know what was required before that hour. They did not want anything of the kind themselves before eight o'clock in the morning, and they naturally assumed that nobody else did. In the constituency which he represented all kinds of business were being transacted at all hours. People worked throughout the night in shifts, and others were arriving in ships from Ireland and the Isle of Man at all hours in the early morning. Consequently there was an absolute necessity for a considerable portion of houses for public refreshment to be open and available. He looked with a great deal of misgivings upon giving the magistrates power to pick out cases where they would close some public-house before eight o'clock, and allow others to remain open. He noticed in this subsection the words "restriction of the circumstances." He would like to know what circumstances required a restriction, and what was a restricted circumstance. He might be wrong, but he assumed that the intention was that in certain circumstances they might make it possible that a traveller would have to go twelve miles before he could get a drink. It would be useful if the hon. and learned Gentleman, in his reply, would give them some indication of what a restriction of the circumstances meant. He could conceive of circumstances under which the imposition of these powers would be of the greatest possible use to some tramways which were about seven miles long. He knew of one tramway in a very populous place seven-and-a-quarter miles long with a number of houses at the other end, and those public-houses would do a roaring trade on Sunday because they would be outside the six miles limit. If it was intended to provide for cases like that he was sure it would not be a good thing to give this special power to prevent people merely taking the exercise. There was also a Government Amendment to leave out the words "Parliamentary or." The intention was to give power to the magistrates to order public-houses to be closed whilst there was a local government election on. He supposed the Government meant such a thing as a city council election. He had fought a number of elections of that sort himself as well as three Parliamentary elections, and the Solicitor-General knew that the only difference was that at one of these elections the ladies could vote and at the other they could not. Were the electors to be trusted to have a glass of beer during the Parliamentary election and to be refused that privilege at elections where the ladies were allowed to vote? That was an invidious distinction to draw. He objected to the whole clause. It left every licence-holder at the mercy of his bench; it did not impose general conditions applicable to all districts; it enabled different benches to impose different restrictions as between one district and another; it enabled different benches to make differences between various licensees; and it also had the further defect that as a bench altered, or the ruling spirit on a bench changed, it enabled the same bench, if they thought fit, in one year arbitrarily to impose an entirely different set of regulations from those imposed in the previous year. One bench this year might tell a number of licensees to do so and so in regard to the internal arrangements of their houses, and another bench in the following year might insist on something entirely different being done. These were some of his objections to the clause. In dealing with the subject involved in the clause there ought to be some definite principles laid down. They were all honestly striving to diminish drunkenness and excessive drinking. In his opinion the proper way to do that was to improve the licensed houses. He believed that every man's conduct arose absolutely from two things, namely, his heredity and his environment. No one could get away from his heredity, but every free man had some power over his environment. His conscientious conviction had always been that they ought to surround the working man who went into a licensed house with a respectable, convenient, and decent environment. He believed the man would behave respectably if they did that; at all events, he would be less likely to behave in a disreputable manner. It was because he was convinced that the whole of the conditions of this clause were calculated to accentuate an opposite state of affairs that he supported the Amendment. The imposition of the further restrictions proposed was bound to have a result contrary to that intended by those who, honestly but mistakenly, advocated them.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said the speech of the hon. Member for the West Derby division might have been more consistent with the admirable traditions of the Liverpool licensing bench. If there was one bench in the country which had exercised the power of imposing conditions it was the Liverpool bench. He knew a good deal in regard to the administration by the justices in Liverpool, and he was full of admiration for their work. He asked the Solicitor-General to tell the House whether this clause applied to all licences in a district. He understood that it did, but as there might be some doubt about the matter it would be well to have it thoroughly cleared up. The only doubt in his own mind arose from the fact that in the past it had been held that the justices in the exercise of their discretion had to act in each individual case, and he wished to know whether in future they would be able to take into consideration all the licences in a district. There had been a great number of small points raised as to the general policy of the clause. He reminded the House that before the Act of 1904 was passed this discretionary power was in existence, although it was not statutory. It arose out of the ancient power of the justices to refuse or renew a licence. Students of Sidney Webb's book knew that in the eighteenth century it was used to give local option and complete Sunday closing. It lasted with more or less vigour until before the Act of 1904, and it enabled a number of benches up and down the country to carry out real reforms in their districts. One of the great complaints against the Act of 1904 was that it destroyed the power of the justices to impose conditions in the same way as before for the good conduct of the trade. He believed that the authors of the Act did not know what they were doing. He was certain from reading the debates that they were absolutely ignorant of the reforming work done by the benches, and that it was by inadvertance they destroyed the power by which the justices were carrying out great reforms throughout the country.

*COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes) said it should not be forgotten that there was no law which enabled the magistrates to compel the carrying out of the work. It was done with the acquiescence of the brewers and the licensees.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said there was certainly the Alehouse Act of 1828 which provided that a licence lasted for a year and no longer, and if the licence-holder did not carry out the conditions, the licence could be taken away subject to appeal. Where there were quarter sessions to back up the local benches there was no virtue in the power of appeal, and, as a matter of fact, brewers and licence-holders were willing to co-operate with the benches in carrying out the conditions imposed. After the passing of the Act of 1904 a case came before the Court of Appeal, and Lord Justice Cozens-Hardy said that this ancient power of imposing conditions was a most wholesome arrangement. Another Judge whose name he did not remember said that the Act of 1904 introduced a deplorable and lamentable revolution in the mode of administering the licensing laws.

*MR. G. D. FABER asked the name of the Judge in the case referred to.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said he would look the matter up and give the hon. Member the reference. The whole power of the justices had been weakened, impaired, and practically destroyed by the Act of 1904. Now the justices were getting back not the whole but a limited part of their former power. He could not imagine why it should be so limited. Perhaps it was because the Government did not wish to cause further financial loss on licence-holders by the imposition of conditions. It would have been very desirable if there had been power given to the justices to require earlier closing of licensed houses in some places. Certainly in London a number of complaints had been made regarding that matter. As to the "long pull" licensed victuallers had complained of the practice over and over again, and the Government had been asked to legislate on the matter in so far as it affected sales under off-licences. It was a practice which was bad for the trade, and certainly it was not good for temperance reform. The justices had been unable to stop the practice in connection with on-licences because they had no control over them. Now that the Government were giving the justices control over them it would be possible to put a stop to the long pull. The hon. Member for the West Derby division had pictured himself on a bicycle and unable to find a public-house open on Sunday. The hon. Member forgot that with a bicycle it would be very easy to convert himself into a *bona fide* traveller.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: The hon. Member is making a mistake. I did not say that I was not a *bona fide* traveller. As a matter of fact I have had an actual experience of the practice, and although I have been a *bona fide* traveller I have found the inn closed.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said that the *bona fide* traveller generally went one mile further on; and besides, there were very few districts throughout the country where a public-house or inn could not be found along the road. He thanked the Government most heartily for the new clause with reference to closing public-houses on election days. An hon. Member opposite said he had never found a case where there were irregularities at municipal elections; but he would refer him to the Report on the Dover election petition as an instance; and in the Minority Report of the Licensing Commission it was stated that a good deal of drinking went on during the polling days at municipal elections. It was said that this clause did not trust the electors of the country; but, at any rate, it trusted them as much as they did in Canada, New South Wales, and New Zealand, and he thought that if they followed the practice in those Colonies they would get on very well. There was one point of principle on which he would join issue with the hon. Member for Liverpool. The hon. Member and those who agreed with him, who pictured an idyllic public-house, a combination of the Continental café and the rural inn of the past, ought to support this clause. He did not think that the hon. Member would realise his ideal of a public-house by the Bill which he had introduced. "Give the liquor trade liberty," it was said, but why did they not use their liberty properly when they had it in the period of free sale from 1830 to 1872? During all those years they had absolutely free power to obtain a licence for any premises they chose, but all that they did was to let loose on the country small squalid houses of the worst character structurally. If the hon. Member had passed his Bill, it would have absolutely destroyed the Act of 1902, and would have struck a blow at the only chance of getting that superior kind of house about which the hon. Member talked. Then the hon. Member had told the House of cases where the justices would not allow sanitary provisions to be made in certain houses. He wondered if these were the doomed houses which the justices wished to get rid of. After all, the Report of the Royal Commission insisted on this power of imposing conditions as being absolutely necessary. One instance was given of an applicant for a licence producing a plan of a large palatial looking building with commerical rooms, dining-rooms, and the like; but it was found afterwards when the licence had been obtained that all the accommodation was a long drinking bar. That kind of thing went on until the Act of 1902 which gave power to the justices to impose conditions as to the re-arrangement of accesses, etc., but thanks to the Act of 1904 the justices had not got those powers now. He insisted that the sole chance of getting improved conditions in public-houses was by giving to the justices the powers set out in this clause. They were told to look to France; but he did not think he had very much to gain from France. In the last three weeks he had happened to light on a little town in the South-East of France, with a population of 2,000 inhabitants, where he saw sights and drink tragedies, the like of which he should not expect to find among a similar population in England. The Leader of the Opposition had complained in the Albert Hall that he was not allowed to play dominoes in a public-house. That was an ancient delusion; the right hon. Gentleman could play dominoes in any public-house in England, and no one would object. There were some games of course which could not be played in a public-house; playing games for money was not permitted. He thought that if they got rid under the Bill of some of the worst houses they would be able to improve those which remained, and these would get a better trade, which was very desirable. All he contended for was that, although under this clause the justices did not get the whole of their old powers, they got some, and on that account he regarded it as a very valuable clause indeed, for which he sincerely thanked the Government. He was sure that many licensing benches, who were pursuing a policy of licensing reform irrespective of party politics, would be glad that the Government had thus placed more power in their hands than they had at present. Some districts, where the justices were backed up by public opinion could go faster than others in the way of reform. He believed that the whole standard of administration would be raised by these powers being given, and he begged to thank the Government for them.

*Mr. GRETTON (Rutland) said that in spite of the very careful way in which the hon. Member for Lincoln had approached the subject in the speech he had just made, he did not explain the principles upon which he proposed to improve the licensed premises of the country by these restrictions. He observed that the hon. Member was very careful not to commit himself to any approval of the scheme which was sketched out in the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Liverpool; nor did he suggest to the House any alternative method of improvement. The hon. Member clearly only went back to old restrictive provisions, which in the opinion of those who knew something of the licensed trade had worked great evil and harm to the character of the houses to which they were applied. The hon. Gentleman had cited the case of Liverpool. Of course, everyone knew that the working of the restrictions in the conduct of licensed premises by the justices in Liverpool had been tried to the uttermost. And what had been the result? The result of restrictive administration did not diminish drunkenness in Liverpool. In spite of all that the Liverpool justices had done, he was told that the statistics for drunkenness in Liverpool had increased. That was a curious commentary upon the result of the restrictions applied by the licensing justices in that town.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): The convictions for drunkenness in Liverpool are less than half what they were.

*MR. GRETTON: In the recent licensing Returns the hon. Member will find that the convictions for drunkenness have increased.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: Since the Act of 1904 was passed, they have gone up; previous to that Act, they diminished from about 16,000 to 4,000.

*MR. GRETTON said that his recollection did not coincide with that of the hon. Member. If he recollected rightly, the convictions for drunkenness had increased steadily and regularly for some considerable time in spite of the reduction in the number of houses, and of the restrictions which the justices had imposed on the remaining houses.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: Only since 1904.

*MR. GRETTON said that the hon. Member for Lincoln seemed to be suffering from the confusion with which the supporters of the Bill had approached the whole subject. The hon. Member said that the reduction of the number of houses proposed by the Bill would enable the structural alterations to be carried out in the remaining houses out of the profits of an increased trade, but he thought that the hon. Member must have forgotten that any increase of profit from any increase of trade, which the hon. Member for Lincoln and his friends hoped would be very small, was to be applied the House was repeatedly told to the sinking fund. A good deal had been said on the subject of the long pull; and hon. Members had quoted expressions of opinion from retailers as to the advisability of suppressing it. With these expressions of opinion he entirely agreed. But if the long pull was to be suppressed, let them have it suppressed everywhere and on some general principle, and not by an arrangement applicable to one licensing district and not to another. If the hon. Member made a tour as a member of the ordinary public and not as an inspector of the licensed houses, within a mile radius of this House, he would find that the playing of games in them had been stopped, even if they were not games of chance or games for money. The hon. Member would also find that many other of the statements he had made were inaccurate with regard to a very large number of the licensed houses in this country. If the Government had proposed any reform which would improve the condition of the houses and the comfort of the customers in order to raise their tone, he would have given them hearty support and placed at their disposal his experience and knowledge. But this clause, however much its authors might disavow it, was a return to those restrictions constantly applied under the pressure of temperance reformers for the degradation of the public-houses, which turned them into mere drinking saloons on the American principle, where nothing was served except "hard drinks" and where customers were to be treated as persons of a disreputable character, slinking into a place which it was lowering to their reputation to enter. That mode of reform had been tried and this clause was an attempt again to carry it on and to degrade the public-houses with a view to their suppression. It was an entirely retrograde step. The other day a small Bill was introduced in another place for improving the public-houses by removing absurd and unreasonable restrictions upon their comforts and accommodation for customers, and in the debate the right rev. gentlemen who were now the friends of the Government attacked it with vehemence, as also did the Lord Chancellor and other members of the Government. Acts were better than words. The Acts of the Government and its friends in another place plainly showed their intentions and the principles embodied in this clause. Until the Government put in words making it clear that the meaning of the clause was not that a policy of restriction and degradation was to be pursued, this clause stood as an invitation to the justices to follow a line which had led to no good, but much harm.

SIR S. EVANS: I have listened with a great deal of attention to every word of this debate and to every speech upon this interesting subject, including that of my hon. friend the Member for Lincoln, who has studied this matter from top to bottom and who knows it probably in all its details and its bearings better than anybody in this House. The speech of my hon. friend makes my task very much easier in replying on behalf of the Government to the criticisms which have been made to the clause and in offering the defence which we think it really deserves. We agree entirely with my hon. friend that this is a most valuable clause. I go further and say without any hesitation that if this clause, and this clause alone, formed a Bill and became an Act of Parliament it would be a most valuable enactment. The matter has been argued from two points of view. First of all, it has been said that we ought not to make these restrictions at all, and in the next place, it has been argued that they are matters which you ought not to put in the discretion of the local justices. I ask are the matters to deal with which we are proposing to endow the justices with power matters which should be dealt with in the regulation of the public-houses, and if they are, how are the matters to be dealt with except by the local magistrates? Can it be contended that the arrangement of the premises and the approach to those premises are not matters fit to be dealt with in the regulation of public-houses? It is said the clause will deteriorate the character of public-houses. We are confident the result will be exactly the contrary. I am not going to discuss at length the question of why public-houses have become merely drinking places. That the houses have become drinking houses is an undoubted fact. Some of these places which were mentioned by my hon. friend the Member for Lincoln are known to me. I know of palatial buildings put up, of a character to satisfy even the requirements of the hon. Member for Liverpool. They came into the hands of the brewers, and they deteriorated into something very little better than the bar of an ordinary public-house. The reason for this is in a large measure that old inns which were dotted about the country in the old days were kept by people who were interested in them personally, whereas now you have 80 per cent. of the houses in which liquor is sold for consumption on the premises owned by people who are not resident in them, and whose interest in the main—they cannot help it—is to increase the consumption of drink and the profits derived therefrom. As to the matters we are entrusting to the justices, the long pull is a matter for the trade rather than the outside public. It has been dealt with by my hon. friend As to the provision with regard to the sale of liquor on Sundays, the justices in many cases have it borne in upon them that the house is more fitted by reason of its character, position, and history to have a six-day rather than a seven-day licence. What is the position now? The licence-holder comes before the justices, who can bring some little pressure, no doubt, to bear upon him arising from the fact that if he does not consent to the suggestion of the justices that he should have a six-day licence, he thinks something will happen to him in the future. We know very often it happens that a person is squeezed on this matter, and the licensing justices have been able to convert premises into premises where you can only get drink on six days a week. We allow the justices in the locality in such cases to prevent the sale of liquor altogether on Sunday, and in order that there may be no unfairness we say the licence duty is to be a six-day and not a seven-day licence duty.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Would it be possible under this clause for the licensing justices in any particular district to apply this six-day licensing provision to all the houses in their district if they choose?

Sir S. EVANS: A sweeping order of that kind would not be in the power of the justices at all, but if the circumstances were the same regarding each public-house in the district they might do it in that way, but they must deal singly and judicially with each case as it comes before them. They may make this provision in regard to one, or they may make it in regard to the other houses in the district.

Sir GILBERT PARKER was understood to say it would have the same effect as a general order.

Sir S. EVANS: Of course if a general order were made they would have no power but to go judicially through the cases of the public-houses in their district; they could restrict the sale of intoxicating liquor during Sunday. As to the *bona-fide* traveller's inn, I am afraid there is in many parts of the country what may be described as the *mala-fide* traveller's inn and not as the *bona-fide* traveller's. Let me give a picture to the House, not an imaginary one, of a peaceful village, say, within seven miles of a great industrial centre, a village where the inhabitants may spend their Sunday restfully and contentedly enjoying themselves. It may well be that persons who cycle out there and frequent the inn may disturb the whole quietness and comfort of the village, so that the inn, in fact, derives the whole of its profits from the trade that is done with these people who come out on Sundays—these *mala fide* travellers as I have called them for this purpose, although it would be difficult to prove that they were not *bona-fide* travellers. It is wrong; and would it not be beneficial to empower the justices, as we propose to do, to say in such a case that this inn is used simply and solely for this purpose, and that it should not be allowed to continue? The hon. Member for Liverpool, who has criticised this Bill with a greater knowledge of these matters than I possess, said there were some Members of this House who would like to see every public-house in the land dirty, inconvenient, and disreputable. I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who desires a single public-house in the whole of our land to answer to that description.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): What I gathered and what I understood the hon. Member to say was that from the hostility shown by some hon. Members opposite to the Bill, he thought they would like to see the public-houses in that condition.

Sir S. EVANS: The noble Lord I do not think could have understood. The hon. Member said there are many Members of this House who would like to see every public-house dirty, inconvenient, and disreputable. I believe there is not a single Member who desires to see a single public-house in the whole of our land to answer that description. No; it is because we believe that the effect of this clause which is now under discussion will be in entirely the contrary direction that we ask the House with every confidence to give it a cordial reception. There are some observations from the point of view of history that I must make. I am now dealing with the question of whether we are unjust. All these conditions which the magistrates are empowered to attach to the renewal of on-licences can already, under the Act of 1904, be attached to every new on-licence. That power, I have no doubt, was given to the magistrates for the purpose of enabling the character of the houses and the trade they did to be raised. If it was right to give the justices the power to apply these conditions to new on-licences, I submit it is also right that they should be allowed to attach them to all on-licences in the country if they think it is necessary. It is said that it may be a burden—that may be so; but I respectfully submit, if a house, owing to its structural condition, or owing to the access to it, or to the arrangement for drinking on the premises, is not fitted any longer to enjoy a licence, it ought to be closed. That was the law also before 1904 as applied to every public-house in the land. Everybody who has studied this matter knows that conditions such as these have been applied in places before the Act of 1904. The reason why there was an alteration after the Act of 1904 was that all that the justices could ask was for a voluntary undertaking on the part of the licence-holder, and the pressure which could be brought to bear before 1904 has disappeared by reason of that Act. Because, under the Act of 1904, if by reason of disobedience to or the neglect of the warning of the licensing authorities a licence was taken away, it was taken away with the obligation to pay compensation, and many licence-holders in consequence made far better terms than were possible before that Act came into operation. It has been said that we may have a variety of conditions arising from capricious and fantastic conduct of the justices. That is not our experience under the present law, and we do not think it is likely to arise under this clause. It is necessary that there should be variety of practice, because there is a great variety in the circumstances and conditions of each locality. It will be admitted by everybody that so long as they are the licensing authority, the justices are the best judges in these matters. Complaint has been made more than once that we have not allowed the justices to regulate the hours for closing at night. We have not done that because, perhaps, there is enough in this clause already, but that brings me naturally to the question of the Amendment which is in my name on the Paper, and which, I hope, will be added to the Bill. This Amendment is intended to deal with what is known as the "noggin" evil. I find from the Home Office that many complaints have been made of this most obnoxious and evil practice, which consists of placing upon the counter of a public-house small noggins of spirits for men proceeding to their work in the morning. The number is so large that there is no time to draw them, and they are placed on the counter so the men can take as many as they like, and in the interests of the men themselves and of their employers it is essential that when it is brought to their knowledge that such an evil as that exists in a locality the justices shall have the power to prevent the practice being continued by putting into force the prohibition of the sale of spirits between six and eight o'clock in the morning. This is important not only from the point of view of the workmen and the employers, but also from the point of view of the licence-holder himself. If he is the owner of the house he can of course easily stop it. If he is not the owner but only the manager how can he possibly say he will not serve these men? He cannot do so. I heard from my hon. friend today that a licensed victualler came to him in a certain city where he had been addressing a meeting and said to him: "Mr. Helme, you are going to bring in a temperance Bill. The best thing you can put into your Bill to promote temperance is a provision to stop any drinking between six and eight in the morning." Reference has been made to a man's loss of work on Monday by reason of his drinking on Sunday. Similarly, by reason of his "noggin," you may have loss of work and great deterioration in the character of the work. I wish to refer incidentally to the new clause relating to polling days. I am not dealing with the question of Parliamentary elections, we have dealt with them in another way. I am now only dealing with local elections. We have given the magistrates power to make such regulations as they think fit. If it is desirable during local elections that some such condition should be attached, surely they should have power to do so. I want to say something with reference to the new clause regarding Parliamentary polling. It has afforded immense amusement to right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, and it provided the Leader of the Opposition with an excuse to vote against the clause, the principle of which he himself put forward in the course of the debates. It is suggested that by reason of the drafting of the clause when an election takes place in one constituency all the public-houses in the remaining 669 constituencies will have to be closed. That is a perfectly absurd contention. It is a mere question of drafting, and I shall be very glad to accept the words of the noble Lord opposite when we come to them. They are quite unnecessary, for there is no Court in the realm which would have construed in the way suggested the new clause as originally drafted. Lest there should be anything in the nature of injustice, undue pressure, or oppression of any kind under any order which the justices may make in attaching conditions to licences under the powers now given to them, we have expressly given the right of appeal to Quarter Sessions against any order made by the licensing justices. We regard this clause as a most valuable clause, so valuable that if it were the only clause it would deserve to become an Act of Parliament.

*MR. RAWLINSON regretted that the Solicitor-General had abandoned the masterly stroke by which they would have showed what they might call the border difficulty. If, when there was an election in one ward, they allowed the public-houses in another ward on the other side of the street to be open, there would be an obvious injustice and anomaly; and, when he read the new clause, he, therefore, saw with delight that the Government were dealing with the difficulty in a masterly way by enacting that in bye-elections all the public-houses throughout the country should be closed. One hon. Member sitting on the same side of the House as himself took it as the serious intention of the Government. He was afraid he did not credit them with the same amount of skill. He realised that the clause had been drawn in a hasty way, and that the masterly stroke was probably the work of the draftsman. The difficulty, therefore, still remained. Did the Government intend that the licensing justices should require a house on one side of the street to be closed when a local government election was taking place in a constituency which included the other side of the street? The learned Solicitor-General had made a most eloquent speech on a subject which he admitted was new to him. He said that the new clause was directed to meet what he called the noggin scandal. He understood that working men, on their way to work between six and eight in the morning, were in the habit of going into public-houses and buying drink.

SIR S. EVANS: What I said was that they are in the habit of getting noggins of spirits.

*MR. RAWLINSON presumed the hon. and learned Member meant that they paid for it in the ordinary way.

Sir S. Evans.

SIR S. EVANS: What I meant was that there was no time to order and that it was there ready for them. They swallow it and put down the money.

*MR. RAWLINSON said he supposed the hon. and learned Member meant that a workman, a well-known customer, went into the public-house and had his usual refreshment ready for him without his making any specific request for it. The Solicitor-General then pointed out the iniquity of drinking in the early morning. There was a lot to be said in favour of that contention. He did not himself drink spirits in the early morning, and therefore in accordance with what he understood to be the principles of modern teetotal legislation he was to have no sympathy with or regard for the rights of those who did. Let the House, if it wished, prohibit the sale of spirits before 8 a.m.; but what he contended was that the question was one for the House to decide and that it should not be left to the local bench. If the Government did not trust the working man, let them boldly say the public-houses were not to be opened in the early morning, and not leave it to the magistrates. He was not, he was afraid, familiar with the pages of the Royal Commissioners' Report, but if his recollection served him rightly, they agreed that it was desirable that matters such as these should be dealt with uniformly and not left to the discretion of the magistrates. That being so, he felt sure that, after the strong temperance speech of the Solicitor-General, if the Government thought this a right thing to do, they should make it universal and compulsory. Surely it was a strong thing to say that the magistrates might close all the public-houses before eight in the morning. Subsections (*a*) and (*b*) dealt simply with the arrangement of the premises and the access to the premises. They made only a slight alteration to the Act of 1902. Under that Act the magistrates had full power to make conditions as to alterations in any part of the premises where intoxicating liquor was sold, and that, he thought, had been held to include access. If such an order was made under the Act of 1902, no fresh order could be made for the ensuing five years. That reasonable protection for the licence-holders was taken away by these subsections. Again, under the Act of 1902, if a licence-holder failed to comply with such an order, he could be fined a particular sum; but these subsections also said that if the magistrates took away his licence for non-compliance with such order he should not be entitled to compensation. That was, he ventured to think, dealing rather harshly with the man. The voice of the trade had been made clear in the question of the long pull. They said it ought to be dealt with in the same manner throughout the country and not left to be dealt with by individual magistrates. He considered that was only reasonable. Another subsection left it to the magistrates to say whether intoxicating liquor should be sold during any part of Sunday. They had been discussing Sunday closing all the afternoon and had arrived at certain resolutions, and now they were going to put it in the power of the local bench to act contrary to those resolutions and make other conditions as to Sunday closing in their district. The trade was entitled to ask that there should be certainty in this matter, and the Government ought to make a law which would be certain throughout the kingdom and not leave it to the discretion of the magistrates who might alter from year to year. The Government had not shown much confidence in the magistrates with regard to the reduction of licences, but this proposed power was ill-placed, because its exercise might vary from year to year according to the individual opinion of magistrates. They were introducing uncertainty, which was injurious to any business, and for that reason he thought the clause was bad in form though its intention might be good.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 286; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 398.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. G. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry

Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. HnA.C. (Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes. F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. HnE. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, RtHn. Sir Thomas
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Fubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)

Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 14, line 24, at the end, to insert the words '(*e*) the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor or of any kind of intoxicating liquor before the hour of 8 a.m. on any day.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 287; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 399.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.

Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A.C. (Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, AH. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hn. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W.E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 27, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 288; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 400.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, NE.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. W. E. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick P.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R. (Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E. (Bury S. Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 14, line 29, to leave out the words 'closing of the premises,' and to insert the words 'prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor for consumption on the premises except to persons lodging on the premises and persons taking meals on the premises in a room set apart for that purpose.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 289 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 401.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan

Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,W. Dudley(Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Hon. R.(Haggerston)
Guinness, W. E.(Bury S.Edm.)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope,JamesFitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohn H.
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson,A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 14, line 30, to leave out the words 'Parliamentary or.'"

"In page 15, line 28, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that in the event of the death of the holder of any such excepted excise licence after the commencement of this Act and before the time when the first application is made for a justices' licence, the person (if any) to whom the excepted excise licence has been transferred shall be deemed to have held that licence at the commencement of this Act.'"

"In page 15, line 33, after the word 'cider,' to insert the words 'and perry.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, further consideration of the Bill, as amended, stood adjourned.

Bill, as amended, to be further considered To-morrow.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 19th November, 1908.

The Lord Westbury took the oath.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations providing for special grants in aid of certain local education authorities in England and Wales in 1908–1909.

PATENTS AND DESIGNS ACT, 1907.

Rule made by the Board of Trade in pursuance of the power conferred upon them by Section 8 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1907.

Rules made by the Board of Trade, CXLVII.—CLXI. Laid before the House (pursuant to the Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (IRELAND) BILL.

Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on an Amendment, moved after the Third Reading on the previous day, in Clause 11 (Amendment of the Land Clauses Act, 1845).

Lord DENMAN said their Lordships would recollect that on the previous evening he was told that his Amendment to Clause 11 was not in order because the words "twenty pounds," referred to in the clause, did not occur in Section 72 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, but did occur in Section 69. The Department had since referred to those sections, and found that that was not the case, but that the words "twenty pounds" did occur in Section 72. He thought it right, in justice to that able official the Government draftsman at the Irish Office, that he should point out that the mistake was not his. The Amendment under discussion on the previous day when the debate was adjourned was to insert, in Clause 11, after the word "Acts," the words "section 71 and." The Clause would then read—

> "For the purposes of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts section seventy-one, and section seventy-two of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, as amended by the Second Schedule to the Act of 1890, shall have effect as if 'one hundred pounds' were substituted therein for 'twenty pounds.'"

He had discussed the point with Lord Atkinson, who now agreed that if the reference to section seventy-one were inserted it would be all that was necessary.

Lord ATKINSON expressed regret for having misled the House on the previous day. He had accurately stated the provisions of the sections, but had inadvertently given the wrong numbers.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord ASHBOURNE moved an Amendment in the same clause providing that the sum of £100 mentioned should be reduced to £60. Those who were familiar, he said, with this subject believed that £100 was too high in respect of a limited owner, and that it would be a reasonable compromise to reduce the sum to £60. If a limited owner were able to get £100 here and £100 there for small houses taken for the purposes of the Bill, the property that would be eventually left to the remainderman might be worth little or nothing. He hoped that, in the circumstances, the Government would accept £60 as a reasonable figure

Amendment moved—

> "In page 7, line 17, to leave out the words 'one hundred' and to insert the word 'sixty.'"—(*Lord Ashbourne.*)

Lord DENMAN said this was an Amendment somewhat limiting the scope of the clause. The noble and learned Lord opposite, Lord Atkinson, also had an Amendment on the same point, and he thought it might be convenient if the two were discussed together.

Lord ATKINSON explained that his Amendment was designed to secure that the sums paid by any particular local authority in respect of any interest in land taken under any scheme to persons not absolutely entitled to the interest purchased should not exceed in the aggregate £300. Under the clause as it stood the limited owner might dispose of a considerable amount of property in £100 portions, and put the money into his own pocket. The object of the Amendment was to lay it down that a limited owner should not be able to part with more than £300 worth of property in this way.

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 18, after the word 'pounds' to insert the words 'Provided that the sums paid under the provisions of Section 72 of the first mentioned statute by any particular local authority in respect of any interest in land taken under any scheme or schemes to a person or persons not absolutely entitled to the interest purchased shall not exceed in the aggregate three hundred pounds.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE failed to see the convenience of taking the two Amendments together. His Amendment was the result of consideration on the part of those who had studied the question on its own merits, and he respectfully pressed it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) then put Lord Ashbourne's Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD DENMAN hoped that, as the House had accepted Lord Ashbourne's Amendment, Lord Atkinson would not consider it necessary to press his Amendment. If it had been shown that there was any real likelihood of such a contingency as the noble and learned Lord had outlined, the Government would have agreed as to the necessity of some such words. A similar clause to the one in the Bill was to be found in the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and in the Labourers Act, 1906, and now that £60 had been inserted instead of £100 the clause was identical with the one in the Labourers Act of 1906. No such safeguard was thought necessary in that case, and the particular evil which the noble and learned Lord feared had never occurred under the other Act he had just quoted. He therefore hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

LORD ATKINSON said the fact that the amount had been reduced to £60 rendered it all the more necessary, in his opinion, to persist in the Amendment. It only now interposed a restriction when the person not absolutely entitled to the interest purchased had received the £60 five times. The noble Lord had made a point of the fact that there was no such safeguarding clause in the Labourers Act. That was quite true; it was not required in that Act, as it was very unlikely that more than one portion of the same property would be taken.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): In spite of what the noble and learned Lord has said, I venture to maintain that my noble friend behind me (Lord Denman) was perfectly right. The object, as I take it, of the noble and learned Lord is to prevent the limited owner from receiving, piece by piece, a sum which becomes large in the aggregate. By reducing the sum which he can receive at one time from £100 to £60 you certainly diminish the probability that in all he will receive a large amount, which it is generally agreed he ought not to have. Therefore, I maintain that the argument of my noble friend is perfectly sound.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD ATKINSON moved an Amendment to Clause 12 relating to the power of bodies corporate to appropriate or grant land for housing purposes, with the view of preventing such appropriation in the case of land held "in trust for some charitable purpose or for some particular purpose specified or defined." He said there was hardly a municipality in Ireland which did not hold agricultural land, which they let to farmers and market gardeners. Nobody desired to prevent such land being devoted by the municipality to the erection of labourers' cottages. But in the case of land held in trust for some charitable purpose or for some particular purpose specified or defined, he was unable to see on what ground of justice or prudence the municipality should be permitted to appropriate that land for housing purposes. It would be unwise as well as unjust to take power to defeat the intentions of benefactors who gave property for specific public purposes, as the result of diverting such property to other uses would be that people would not make these benefactions.

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, lines 3 and 4, to leave out the words "for public or charitable purposes" and to insert the words "in trust for some charitable purpose, or for some particular public purpose specified or defined, as distinguished from the general purposes of a municipality or township or the general benefit or advantage of the inhabitants thereof."—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

LORD DENMAN said it would be within the recollection of their Lordships that, on the Report stage, the words "nothing in this Act" were substituted for the words "nothing in this section." The subsection now read—

"(4) Provided that nothing in this Act shall authorise the appropriation or utilisation for the purposes of the Act of any common or commonable land, or any recreation ground, village green, or other open space dedicated to the use of the public, or any disused burial ground, or any land held on trusts which prohibit building thereon, or held for public or charitable purposes."

That Amendment, in the opinion of the Government, made the whole clause so impossible that it would be a waste of time on his part to oppose any alteration in the clause as it stood, in whatever direction amendment might be proposed. He admitted, however, that the words which the noble and learned Lord now desired to insert were very much better, from their point of view, than the words in the Bill, and therefore he had no objection to their being inserted at this stage.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE moved a new clause enacting that the Act should not apply to any town having a population of less than 2,000. It would be remembered that at the last stage he moved a similar Amendment, but it was then pointed out by the noble Lord in charge of the Bill that, as drafted, it would have a much narrower effect than was desired by its supporters; and it was in order to put right the mistake in drafting that he now moved this Amendment. He had since found that he was inaccurate in stating that the Amendment would exclude twenty-four towns from the operation of the Act. He made that statement from a rather hurried examination of the table published in a well-known directory. Six towns were already excluded from the operation of the Bill as they did not possess town commissioners, and therefore the number he should have given as the towns which would be excluded under his Amendment was eighteen. The main fact remained that if the Amendment was accepted the Bill would still apply to about one-third of the population of Ireland. A great many small towns in Ireland would not be called towns in England, and there were many whose acreage exceeded their population. The provisions of the Bill were not necessary in these small towns.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the following new clause: 'This Act shall not apply to any town the population of which at the last Census was less than two thousand.'"—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD DENMAN was grieved to think that any argument he had used at an earlier stage of the Bill should have afforded fresh material for noble Lords opposite still further to mutilate the measure. Of all the harmful and destructive Amendments that had been moved and carried in this Bill, he regarded this as one of the worst. Not only would it exclude certain towns from the benefit of the Bill—that was serious enough from the point of view of the Government—but it went still further. The Bill repealed certain earlier housing Acts, and if the Amendment were adopted it would strike out a number of urban districts from the advantages of the Bill. Former housing Acts being repealed the Amendment would take away from those districts rights already conferred by Parliament. The names of the urban districts to which he referred were Belturbet, Carrickmacross, Castleblayney, Coothill, Granard, Keady, Newcastle (County Down), Portrush, Tanderagee, Trim and Warrenpoint. Surely it was rather a new departure for an individual Member of the House to move an Amendment on Third Reading which would take away from certain urban districts rights conferred by Parliament and which they had exercised in past years without, as he understood, any complaint whatever.

He trusted that, after what he had said, the noble Lord would not think fit to press the Amendment.

LORD ASHBOURNE said he supposed the noble Lord had considered the observations he had made, but he would point out that the Amendment stated that this Bill should not apply to any town with a population of less than 2,000. There was no schedule of repeals, and, from a hasty examination of the Bill while the noble Lord was speaking he did not see how it could interfere with existing legislation.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I understand that the matter arises in this way, that these excluded districts could not administer the Housing Acts, because Clause 6 applies to all Orders of the Local Government Board made after the passing of this Act. Therefore, if one of these bodies were to apply to the Local Government Board for an Order it could only be obtained under Clause 6; and if the Act is not to apply to these districts Clause 6 would not apply to them, and they would, therefore, be unable to obtain an Order at all. That, I think, is the point which my noble friend desires to make.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Moved, "That the Bill do pass."—(*Lord Denman.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committe."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee accordingly.

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair.]

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I think it would be convenient that I should, in a very few words, state to your Lordships what this Committee stage amounts to. This is a Bill which was referred to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses, and is for the purpose purely of consolidation. The Committee went through the Bill and reported that, as far as it could do so, it exactly reproduced the law. In addition, they recommended certain Amendments, in respect of which they said—

> "Some slight modifications of the law, which would not substantially alter it but tend to convenience, were suggested. The Committee have considered these suggestions, and recommend that the Amendments set out below be made. None of them affects the existing law in any important point; but, as they may affect it in some degree, they can hardly be called verbal Amendments."

I propose to move that the Amendments recommended by the Committee be inserted *en bloc.* I am extremely anxious, in this very valuable work of consolidating the law, that the Committee should be absolutely loyal to the directions of the House, and that, unless it is quite clear that the law is merely reproduced, they should report the Bill in the consolidated form and describe the nature of the Amendments before the House is asked to accept them. These Amendments really are of a kind that ought to be accepted for convenience. They were unanimously recommended by the Committee, and I hope your Lordships will insert them.

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE: I assume that we may take the Memorandum attached to the Bill as, in the opinion of the Government, a full and accurate statement of the position?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Yes. The Amendments were unanimously recommended by the Joint Committee of both Houses, and this is the procedure we propose to adopt in the work of consolidation in future.

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived, and the Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 228.)

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

LORD KENYON: My Lords, before we adjourn I should like to ask the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can give the House any information in reference to the report of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Pennsylvania.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I am sorry to say that the report alluded to by the noble Lord is correct. On Monday, 16th November, the Board received an intimation by cable from the British Consul at Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) that foot and mouth disease had appeared at Danville (Pennsylvania), a town in the centre of the eastern part of Pennsylvania, and about seventy miles from the port. Every port inspector of the Board was notified at once by telegram and enjoined to take special care in veterinary examination of all animals landed from America for slaughter. The Consul was instructed by the Foreign Office to report fully by telegram particulars upon which the report was based. I sent information to Lord Strathcona, and had an interview with him on the subject. On Wednesday, the 18th, a report from the Consul was received stating that the disease had been fully diagnosed as aphthous fever—foot and mouth disease—by both the Federal and State authorities. A later telegram stated that the senior veterinary officer of Pennsylvania reported that fourteen farms were affected in four counties adjacent to Danville; that 230 animals had been found affected with the disease and 200 destroyed. We are informed that the disease is under complete control and that the authorities are quite satisfied that the outbreak is checked. On receiving this information the Board decided forthwith to add the State of Pennsylvania to the Schedule of the Foreign Animals Order of 1903 and to that of the Foreign Hay and Straw Order of 1908. The necessary Order was made yesterday and comes into force on the 21st instant. The effect of the Order is to prohibit the landing in Great Britain of animals or of hay or straw from Pennsylvania as from that date, but special steps will be taken for dealing with cargoes now on the seas. The issue of the Order has been notified to the Federal Government by cable through the British Ambassador at Washington, who has been asked to acquaint the Board with precise particulars as to the nature and extent of the restrictions which have been imposed by the American authorities as regards the movement of animals within or out of the State of Pennsylvania.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 19th November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

Petition from Leytonstone, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1907–8.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th November; *Mr. Hobhouse*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 332.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Intelligence Division, Part II. Proceedings under the Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907, and Section 2, Subsection 3, of The Board of Agriculture Act, 1889, for the year 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (CONTRACTS).

Return ordered, "of all Contracts made in the United Kingdom for manufactured articles by the several Government Departments in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1908, either with contractors outside the United Kingdom or with contractors or agents who obtain the articles from Abroad (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 327, of Session 1907)."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Salaries of Minor Staff Officers of Income Tax Repayments Branch.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the minor staff officers serving in the Income-Tax Repayments Branch of the Inland Revenue Department, on a scale of £200 to £300 per annum, are receiving, as a result of promotion, less salary than if they had remained Second Division clerks under the new scale of pay established by the Order in Council of 21st December, 1907; and whether, in view of the fact that they must serve further periods, varying from ten to sixteen years, before they receive any benefit from their promotion, as compared with the salary they would have received as Second Division clerks, he will take steps to arrange that these officers be given the salary they would have received if the scale for their posts had been £250 to £350.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative as regards the majority of these officers at any rate. The object of the Order in Council was to allow members of the Second Division the option of a present benefit in place of a future benefit, and those who took advantage of that option must necessarily appear to be placed in a better relative position than others to whom the Order in Council does not apply, when their immediate emoluments only are compared. The reasons for allowing this option did not apply in the case of the officers in question, but the maximum of their scale has recently been increased from £300 to £350. I am not prepared to make any further concession in their case.

Irish Public-Houses under £5 Valuation.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state how many licensed public-houses in Ireland are valued at less than £1 and £5 respectively for the Poor Law valuation.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I have not got this information and I do not think the considerable expenditure of labour and money which its preparation would involve would be justified.

Recruiting of Post Office Telephone Staff.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the question of recruiting the telephone staffs by open competition, in the same manner as the telegraph department.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The question of recruiting telephonists by means of open competitions has been fully considered. Candidates for such employment, besides having the prescribed educational knowledge, must possess certain qualifications, such as pitch of voice and clearness of enunciation, which cannot be tested except by personal examination; and the substitution of open competition for the present method of appointment by selection and nomination would not appear to be satisfactory.

Extra Police in County Galway.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of the extra police in County Galway and the amount charged for them against the county council; the number transferred from other counties and what counties they have been transferred from, as well as the number sent from the depot in Dublin; what is the legal quota allowed for the county and when it was filled up; whether any of the cost of the men required to fill it has been charged to the county council; and whether any expenses for extra police were incurred by the county council before the quota was filled up.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The extra force in County Galway consists of one head constable and 345 sergeants and constables, and they are charged for at the following rates, viz.: Head constables

£43 6s. per man per annum; sergeants and constables, £34 9s. 3d. per man per annum. The amount payable and due by the county council for extra police in respect of the year ended 30th September, 1908 is £8,055 10s. 9d. When the county was proclaimed in August 1907 the following detachments, which were then serving in it, became, by virtue of the proclamation and warrant under 6 Will. IV., c. 13, s. 13, an additional police establishment under that Act, viz.—

	Head Constables.	Sergeants and Constables.
From Reserve at Depot - . - -	1	57
From County of Limerick - - - -	—	10
,, ,, Kerry - - - -	—	10
,, ,, Kildare - - - -	—	5
,, ,, Wexford - - - -	—	4
,, ,, Kilkenny - - - -	—	1
,, ,, Wicklow - - - -	—	5
	1	92

By warrants issued subsequently that additional police establishment was increased by permanent transfers at various times, as follows—

	Head Constables.	Sergeants and Constables.
From County of Antrim - - - -	—	15
,, ,, Armagh - - - -	—	5
,, ,, Cork, East Riding - -	—	10
,, ,, Cork, West Riding - -	—	9
,, ,, Donegal - - - -	—	13
,, ,, Down - - - -	—	5
,, ,, Dublin - - - -	—	10
,, ,, Kerry - - - -	—	23
,, ,, Kilkenny - - - -	—	29
,, ,, Louth - - - -	—	2
,, ,, Londonderry - - -	—	5
,, ,, Mayo - - - -	—	16
,, ,, Monaghan - - - -	—	3
,, ,, Queen's - - - -	—	7
,, ,, Tipperary, South Riding -	—	1
,, ,, Tyrone - - - -	—	12
,, ,, Waterford - - - -	—	8
,, ,, Wexford - - - -	—	5
,, ,, Wicklow - - - -	—	8
From Depot (Recruits) - - - -	—	67
	—	253
Already in County - - - - - -	1	92
Grand Total - - - - -	1	345

The free quota of the county is 616 sergeants and constables, and has been practically full since the redistribution of 1906. County councils are never charged for men required to fill deficiencies in the free force, any claims which are made being for men in excess of that force.

Cookstown Creamery Instructor.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) by whom was Mr. Carroll appointed as creamery instructor for the Cookstown district, and on whose recommendation; whether he underwent an examination for the position, and, if so, who were the examiners; whether, notwithstanding the dissatisfaction created among creamery owners and managers by this appointment, as evidenced by the fact that over three-fourths of the creameries withdrew from the 1907 summer surprise competitions, the Department has renewed the appointment in 1908; and whether, with a view to restoring the confidence of the trade in this portion of the Department's work, he will consider the advisability of having such appointments made in the future from among qualified creamery managers and by competitive examination.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) Mr. Carroll, after having been examined and recommended by the responsible officers of the Department, was appointed by Sir Horace Plunkett as instructor in dairying and was assigned by the Department to a northern district, with head-quarters at Cookstown, a position which he still holds. In reply to the concluding portion of the Question, I have merely to repeat the statement which I made in response to previous Questions of a like character, viz., that the Department are not prepared to confine the appointment of instructor in dairying to creamery managers, nor are they of opinion that appointment by competitive examination would secure the best men.

Christmas Employment in the Post Office.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to notices issued in provincial offices asking the staffs to recommend respectable men for temporary employment for Christmas pressure, and in which it is stated that men over fifty years of age should not be recommended; whether he will state why these men are barred from the Post Office portion of the proposals for the relief of unemployment; and whether he will take steps to have this proviso withdrawn.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) My attention has not previously been called to the notices referred to. But, in view of the exacting nature of the work at Christmas, I do not think the employment in the provinces of temporary men over fifty years of age is, as a general rule, desirable. It is a question, indeed, whether at the larger provincial offices the limit of age should not be fixed at forty-five, as in London.

Penny Postage in America.

MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can give any figures showing the extent to which correspondence between this country and the United States of America has increased since the introduction of the penny postage between the two countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Returns in the case of the homeward mails are not sufficiently complete for an estimate to be made of the increase in the American postings. With regard to the mails sent from this country, the net weight of letters and postcards for the first four weeks of September last was 35,600 pounds and for the first four weeks of October it was 45,340 pounds.

The Unemployed and Christmas Work in the Post Office.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in the engagement of the extra staff for Christmas work, preference has been and will be given to men who are genuinely out of employment over those who are taking their holidays at that time or who are in receipt of a pension, seeing that many such persons have been employed in previous years.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The instructions issued provide that preference should be given to men who are genuinely unemployed; a man on holiday would not be regarded as eligible. A small number of places in London are allotted to ex-Army men who are supplied by the chief recruiting staff officer; and inquiry is not made whether any of these men are in receipt of pensions or on furlough preparatory to leaving the Colours.

Bastardy Laws.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill to amend the Bastardy Laws, empowering boards of guardians, on paternity being proved, to obtain an order against the putative father of any bastard child born in the workhouse, charging such putative father with the cost incurred by the ratepayers for the maintenance both of the child and of the mother during the whole period of her residence in the house, such cost being limited to 5s. per week as in the case of ordinary bastardy orders.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware of the point raised in the Question. It is one that will, I have no doubt, be touched upon in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, and pending their Report I do not consider that I could properly deal with it.

Yacht Lake on Hackney Marshes.

Mr. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a communication from the Central (Unemployed) Body asking him to sanction a scheme for the establishment of a model yacht lake in Hackney Marshes; and, if so, whether he has been able to consider favourably this application.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. In the circumstances the second part of the Question does not arise.

Croydon Distress Committee.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received an application for a grant from the Croydon Distress Committee; whether he is aware that the financial resources of this committee are nearly exhausted, and that, consequently, it is only finding employment for a small number of men; and whether his Board will sanction the grant asked for without further delay.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received an application in this case, and I informed the town council on the 4th instant that if they would carry out a proposed improvement scheme at Addiscombe Road I should be prepared to give £1,000 to the distress committee towards the cost of unskilled labour to be supplied by the committee. I am ready to make the payment at once on hearing from the town council.

Local Government Loans.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will furnish the House with particulars as to the loans sanctioned by his Board up to date, in continuation of the White Paper recently published.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I will send my hon. friend particulars on this subject. I do not think another Parliamentary Paper need at present be issued with regard to it.

Emigration of the Unemployed.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can give the number of emigrants, with their dependants, sent out by the Central (Unemployed) Body for London and by the provincial distress committees for the complete year 1907, together with the cost to the Central Body and the provincial committees, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Returns which I have received are for the half year ending 30th September, 1907, and 31st March, 1908. The total number of persons assisted to emigrate during the year ended 31st March, 1908, by the Central (Unemployed) Body for London was 4,397, including 3,076 dependants, and by provincial distress committees 1,669, including 1,232 dependants. The cost incurred in the emigration of these persons by the Central (Unemployed) Body was £30,996 and by the provincial committees £11,784.

Special Committees of Relief.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state how many special committees have been set up in accordance with the Unemployed Workmen Act in those counties and county boroughs where no distress committees have been created; and if he will state in how many, and what, counties and county boroughs this provision of the Act has not been complied with.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Returns have not been received as to these cases. I regret, therefore, that I am not in a position to give my hon. friend the particulars for which he asks.

Unemployed Women in Manchester.

MR. CLYNES: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received communications respecting the extent of distress amongst unemployed women in Manchester; whether he is aware that no work has been found for the majority of the registered women; and whether he can, by a grant of money or by other means, assist in meeting the urgent necessities of the unemployed women.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I received a communication on this subject from the town clerk of Manchester in April last, but at that time there was no Parliamentary grant available for the purposes of the Unemployed Workmen Act. I do not find that I have since received any communication with regard to the matter, and hence I am unable to express any opinion with regard to it. If any application is made to me by the distress committee it will receive my consideration.

Runcorn Vaccination Case.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if the nine weeks old female child of Mr. Edward Johnson, of 14, Albert Street, Runcorn, was vaccinated on 29th September last when the mother was suffering from an abscess on the breast, which led to the death of the child within about sixteen days of vaccination; and if he will institute an inquiry with a view to the prosecution of the medical man for negligence and breach of Section 4, Clause 1, of the Vaccination Act, 1898.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The mother appears to have been suffering from an abscess when the child was vaccinated, but the public vaccinator informs me that he was not aware of this. In any case, Section 1 (4) of the Act of 1898 does not apply in this instance. That subsection only deals with cases where the child cannot safely be vaccinated owing to the condition of the house in which the child resides, or to the recent prevalence of infectious disease in the district.

Customs Statistical Department Staff.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is prepared to take steps whereby the senior abstractors of the Statistical Department of His Majesty's Customs may be able to count the whole of their unestablished service in qualifying for pensions.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the replies given by my predecessors to Questions on this subject.

Factory Inspectors.

MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the present number of factory inspectors of all classes; and what are the corresponding numbers for the year 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The total authorised strength of the factory inspectorate is now 200. In 1905 it was 154.

Motor Traffic on the Embankment.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the danger to the public arising from the fast motor traffic on the Embankment and to the apparent futility of appeals to Government Departments to check the excessive speed of cars; and if he will give the necessary instructions to have policemen stationed on point duty at intervals along the roadway to insure that at such points at any rate pedestrians can make the attempt to cross the Embankment under the protection of a constable.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The Commissioner of Police is endeavouring to secure the provision of more refuges on the Embankment, but he does not think the volume of traffic there is so heavy as to justify the stationing of a number of constables for the purpose suggested. I am having inquiry made, and will inform my hon. friend if I find any further steps are necessary and practicable.

Home Office Orders.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, previous to issuing Orders Nos. 806, 807, 808, and 809, relating to florists' workshops and Scottish hospital laundries, he consulted the employees engaged in the trades.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Before making the Orders I had received a petition signed by a considerable number of those employed in the florist trade, and I had sent copies of all four Orders, while in draft, to the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, in accordance with the arrangement existing between that committee and the Home Office, for communication to the unions or organsiations concerned.

Single School Areas in Wales.

MR. WALTER ROCH (Pembroke): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can give the number of single voluntary school areas in Wales for the year 1907–8.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The number was 307 on 31st March last.

Schools and Scholars in Wales.

MR. WALTER ROCH: To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can give the number of council and voluntary public elementary schools, respectively, in Wales; and the number of scholars on the school registers attending at such schools, respectively, for the year 1907–8.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The figures for 1907–8 are not yet available. Those for 1906–7 are as follows—

	Council Schools.	Voluntary Schools.
Number - - - - - - -	1,066	720
Average number on Registers - -	324,607	102,857

Meals for School Children.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his Department has advised local education authorities that they themselves must attempt to raise voluntary funds for the provision of meals before applying for authority to put the provisions of Clause 3 of the Provision of Meals Act into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question on 22nd October.

Education Proposals.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his statement that the Government is determined, in any arrangement agreed to by them for a settlement of the education question, that passive resisters' grievances must be finally wiped out, is to be taken as meaning that the Government propose that in future no public money derived either from rates or taxes shall be used for denominational teaching in elementary schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I must ask my hon. friend to await the publication of the proposals of the Government on the education question.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: To ask the President of the Board of Education if, in view of the public interest taken in his proposals for a settlement of the education controversy, and the conflicting reports of the tenour of the arguments used by him in his address to Nonconformist Members of this House, he will now publish the official note taken during the delivery of the speech.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No, Sir. The address referred to was given at a private meeting, and it is not proposed to publish the report.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: To ask the President of the Board of Education if, in his efforts to arrive at a settlement of the education controversy, he proposes to concede what is known as the right of entry within school hours subject to certain reservations, including a provision that the cost of giving sectarian teaching shall not fall on public funds; and, if so, whether he proposes to include in such cost a due proportion of the expenditure on the school building and of the general maintenance and administrative charges.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I must ask my hon. friend to await the publication of the proposals of the Government on the education question.

Distribution of Education Fund.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the statement issued by the representatives of the authorities in the educational areas adversely affected by the substituted scheme of distribution of the balance of the education fund; if so, in view of the statement of the Government as to the education fund being distributed according to the educational necessities of the districts, can he see his way to re-arrange or modify the distribution of the education fund on the principles laid down in the statement referred to.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am fully acquainted with the views of the authorities in question, as these have been presented to me by two successive deputations. I am also aware that these views are strongly opposed to those of the representatives of a greater number of districts. The distribution of the fund, as shown in the Return ordered to be printed on 3rd June, conforms to the instructions of Clause 15 (2) of the Bill, and I do not see my way at present to propose any other mode of distribution.

Lanarkshire Education Grant.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland what will be the average increase in the amount of Government grants to elementary schools in Scotland after the second scheme of allocation is effected; and what will be the increase in particular to Lanarkshire.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) While it is confidently anticipated that there will be a substantial increase in the amount of grant to elementary schools generally under the provisions of the Bill, it is not possible at present to estimate the amount of increase with any exactness, and it is inexpedient to give figures which might possibly be misleading.

New Law Courts.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can say why it has become necessary to destroy the open space at the western side of the Law Courts by erecting additional Law Courts upon it; and what will be the estimated cost of these proposed erections.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The open space on the western side of the present Law Courts has always been reserved for the purpose of erecting additional ones. These being now required, the work has been put in hand at an estimated total cost of £95,000, of which £5,000 was voted in the Office of Works Estimates in this House on 2nd April this year.

Pension Officers.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the list of successful applicants under the Old-Age Pensions Act in the Carnarvon pension officer's district and the Swaffham pension officer's district, published in the Carnarvon *Herald* and the *Eastern Daily Press*; and whether the Government are prepared to take any steps to prevent the publication in future of the names of successful applicants in the Press.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have no knowledge of the source of the information published in the cases referred to. So far as the pension officers are concerned, the Board of Inland Revenue have issued a circular directing that, except as laid down in their instructions to pension officers, no officer in their service shall communicate any information or statistics relating to old-age pensions otherwise than to his official superiors or to the pension committee with which he is connected. There is, however, no statutory obligation to secrecy upon the local pension committee, and it is within the discretion of that committee to publish a list of the pensions awarded, if they think proper to do so. I do not think it is at all desirable that the names of successful applicants should be made public, and I hope that the pension committees will, as a rule, abstain from issuing them to the Press.

Wellington (Somerset) Pensions Officials.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in view of the intention of the Government that the administration of the Old-Age Pensions Act was to be dissociated directly and indirectly from the administration of the Poor Law, whether his attention has been called to the administration of the Act in the urban district of Wellington, Somerset, where the pensions sub-committee holds its meetings at the union workhouse, the clerk to the committee is clerk to the guardians, and six members of the sub-committee are guardians; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps to secure that the intention of the Government shall be carried out.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I agree with the hon. Member that it is highly undesirable that a pensions sub-committee should hold its meetings at a union workhouse, but there are no provisions in the Act which would prevent them doing so if they think fit. I hope, however, that this practice will not become general. The members of sub-committees are appointed, under subsection 2 of Section 8 of the Act, by the local pension committee, and I have no power to interfere in the matter.

Check on Pension Officers' Work.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether supervisors have been appointed to verify and check the reports and proceedings of pension officers in pursuance of the instructions issued by the Board of Inland Revenue in September last; and, if so, how is it that no mention is made of these supervisors in the regulations recently issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) All supervisors and officers of excise have been appointed by the Treasury to be pension officers under Section 10 of the Old-Age Pensions Act. The term "pension officer" in the regulations, therefore, includes the supervisor. All pension officers of a rank below that of supervisor are required by Departmental instructions to submit their reports to the supervisor for approval before they are forwarded to the pension committee.

Poor Relief and Old-Age Pensions.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have decided that Poor Law relief granted to a husband for the use of his wife disqualifies the husband but not the wife for receipt of an old-age pension; whether the effect of this decision is to annul the pauper disqualification in the case of all married women, seeing that Poor Law relief is always granted to the husband, whether for his use, for the use of his wife, or for the use of both; and whether, in view of the importance of this decision, he will take immediate steps to instruct the Commissioners to bring it to the notice of pension officers and local pension committees.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The question is one of law, upon which no authoritative decision can be arrived at until it has been settled by the Local Government Board upon an appeal. In cases in which pension officers have sought legal advice through the Board of Inland Revenue they have been advised in the sense indicated in the Question. But I do not think it would be desirable to issue any general instructions until the question has been decided upon appeal.

Instructions to Pension Officers.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the instructions issued to pension officers on 1st September last purported to be issued under the authority of the old-age pensions regulations; and whether there was anything on the instructions to show that they were confidential.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Article 34 of the old-age pension regulations requires pension officers in the execution of their office to observe and follow the orders, instructions, and directions of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. The instructions given from time to time to pension officers by the Board of Inland Revenue are issued through the ordinary departmental channels under the general powers possessed by the Board, in common with other public Departments, to give directions to officers under their Departmental control. Officers are required by the ordinary rules of the public service to treat all instructions so issued as confidential in character, and it is not regarded as necessary, nor is it usual, that the communication in which the instruction is given should be specially so marked.

Professor Marshall's Memorandum on the Fiscal Question.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the object of the publication at the present time by His Majesty's Treasury of the Memorandum by Professor Marshall on the fiscal question; what was the cost of it; under which Vote will it be included; and will the Treasury publish and circulate in the same way a reply to it and to the arguments and disputed statements contained in it.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Professor Marshall's Memorandum on the Fiscal Policy of International Trade, which was prepared for the late Government, has been published now in consequence of a pledge given by the Prime Minister to the hon. Member for Dulwich on 2nd June last in the course of the debate on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill. The hon. Member had challenged certain figures which I had quoted in regard to the cost of living in Germany, and, in accordance with the invariable custom of this House, we immediately agreed to lay upon the Table the document from which they had been extracted. The cost of printing the Memorandum is £12, which will be included under the Stationery Office Vote. The same reasons would not apply for incurring the cost of publishing further Memoranda on the same subject.

Pension Funds and Income Tax.

Mr. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if sums of money contributed out of annual profits by employers of labour and handed over to trustees to be invested and used for the purpose of pensions for their old and disabled workpeople are liable to income-tax duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is not the practice to charge with income-tax sums of money contributed by employers and handed over to trustees for the purpose of providing pensions for their old and disabled workpeople.

Income Tax and Death Duty Returns.

Mr. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can see his way to arrange that in future the figures relating to income-tax and death duties issued by his Department shall be given for Wales and Monmouth separately from England.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is not possible under existing arrangements to separate the figures relating to income-tax and death-duties for Wales and Monmouth and for England respectively. Several of the collecting areas, such as Chester, Hereford, and Shrewsbury, include districts on both sides of the border, and, moreover, the duties are not necessarily paid locally, but are in many cases collected in London.

Scottish Volunteer Ranges.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the fact that many volunteer shooting ranges in Scotland are put in charge of well-paid artisans, while many Army pensioners in the neighbourhood are quite competent and willing to fill these positions; and if he will by circular or otherwise bring pressure to bear on the authorities so that a preference may be given to those who are not in receipt of an artisan's wage.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The War Office has received no representations on this subject. This is entirely a question for the County Associations, and it is not considered desirable to interfere with their discretion in the matter.

Emigrated Reservists.

MAJOR RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of emigrated reservists up to 1st November last, and how many of these belong to the Royal Engineers, Royal Artillery, cavalry, and infantry, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) On 1st November 5,948 Army Reservists had permission to reside abroad, including over 1,000 who were at sea. Of this number there were 327 Royal Engineers, 642 Royal Horse Artillery and Royal Field Artillery, 506 Royal Garrison Artillery, 548 cavalry, and 3,407 infantry, including Foot Guards.

Cheap Ammunition for Rifle Clubs.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to lay upon the Table a statement showing the conditions under which ammunition will be supplied to rifle clubs at reduced rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question is still under consideration.

Clonelly Evicted Tenants.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired any land for restoration of evicted tenants near Clonelly, County Fermanagh, in connection with which they could consider the claim for restoration of Mr. John Graham, of Banagh, Clonelly, an evicted tenant whose claim has been favourably noted by the Commissioners; and can he state how many (if any) evicted tenants in County Fermanagh have been restored under the Evicted Tenants Act and otherwise, respectively, through the intervention of the Estates Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners do not appear to have acquired any land near Clonelly for the restoration of evicted tenants. They have noted John Graham's name for consideration in the allotment of such untenanted land as they may acquire. Up to the present, twenty-nine evicted tenants or their representatives have been reinstated or provided with holdings in County Fermanagh.

Marquess of Ely's Fermanagh Lands.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have acquired or agreed to purchase any untenanted lands on the estate of the Marquis of Ely in Fermanagh; and, if so, what is the acreage thereof; and will the Estates Commissioners, in dealing with the untenanted lands, consider the claims of evicted tenants of the county, inasmuch as there is very little land in the county that could be acquired under the Evicted Tenants Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Proceedings have been instituted under the Irish Land Act, 1903, for the sale of over 700 acres of untenanted land on this estate to the Estates Commissioners, but the Commissioners are not yet in a position to enter into a formal agreement to purchase. If the Commissioners acquire the land, they will consider in its allotment the applications of the evicted tenants in County Fermanagh who have been noted as suitable.

Ely Estate Evicted Tenant.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for restoration, under the Evicted Tenants Act, from William M'Cullagh, of Drumcose, on the Ely Estate, whose grandfather was evicted from the lands of Corsicon on that estate in 1876; and if, as appears, the applicant is not within the benefit of that Act, the Commissioners will, in the pending sale of Lord Ely's estate, provide a holding for the applicant under Section 2 of the Purchase Act, 1903, as the son of a tenant of a holding on the estate, on which basis he appears to be qualified to receive an advance.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) M'Cullagh's application as the representative of an evicted tenant does not come within the provisions either of the Evicted Tenants Act or of the Irish Land Act, 1903. His application for an allotment under Section 2 of the latter Act, as the son of a tenant on the Ely estate, will be considered by the Estates Commissioners when the estate is being dealt with in its order of priority.

Kilburryhut Evicted Tenant.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an alternative holding has yet been found for Mrs. Maher, evicted tenant, Kilburryhut, County Tipperary; and, if so, how soon is she likely to be placed in possession.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners report that they have not yet been able to provide a holding for Mrs. Margaret Maher, but her case is at present in the hands of an inspector with this object.

Roscrea Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board for Ireland issued an Order, entitled the Roscrea (No. 1) Rural District Labourers (Unopposed) Order, 1907, which authorised the building of thirty-nine labourers' cottages under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 1883 to 1906; that the council of the Roscrea (No. 1) Rural District, on 14th October last, decided to apply to, and did subsequently apply to, the Local Government Board for sanction to a loan of £7,430 to acquire the necessary land and build the thirty-nine cottages authorised by the Order mentioned, the loan being at the rate of £190 10s. 3d. per cottage and plot; and, seeing that the loan is based on prices for building, fencing, and other expenses approved by the Local Government Board, and for land at prices fixed by the arbitrator appointed by the said Board, will he explain why the Local Government Board have written to the said rural district council sanctioning a loan of £6,825 only, being at the rate of £175 per cottage; is he aware that this decision of the Board practically blocks the working of the Labourers Acts in this rural district, where the labourers are living in houses condemned as unfit for human habitation, and are living in misery waiting the provision of suitable and sanitary dwellings under the Labourers Acts; and, under these circumstances, will he arrange that the necessary sanction will be given to the full amount of the loan, which is the lowest possible sum at which these cottages and plots can be provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The facts are as stated in the Question. The loan which the Local Government Board have sanctioned is £5 per cottage above the usual amount. Should it prove insufficient, the Board will consider the propriety of authorising the district council to obtain a supplemental loan in the open market. The Board are anxious to provide as many cottages and plots as possible out of the limited fund available for the purpose and cannot, therefore, sanction loans at high rates to some district councils to the prejudice of others having equal claims.

Small Holdings in Derbyshire.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): To ask the hon. Member for

South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether 153 applications for 2,284 acres have been sent in to the county council of Derbyshire under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act; why no information is forthcoming as to the steps taken to meet these applications; and whether the Board of Agriculture can do anything to assist the county council to satisfy the applicants.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The county council have not quite completed their inquiries into the applications received, but so far as they have gone it appears that the majority of the applicants are suitable and the county council are endeavouring to obtain land. One of our inspectors has recently conferred with the council, and we hope to receive several schemes in the near future.

University College Grants.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the Report of the Permanent Advisory Committee on University College Grants was received by the Treasury, and when it will be published.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Report was received by the Treasury on 25th July last. The Committee's recommendations affect the Board of Education as well as the Treasury, and are still under consideration by the former Department. It is not proposed to publish the Report until decisions have been arrived at upon the various recommendations contained therein. It is not yet possible to say definitely how soon that will be.

Hammersmith Guardians' Loan.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a loan was sanctioned for the purchase of the land behind the Hammersmith guardians' office; and whether, when the land was obtained, there was any stipulation that it should not be used for sand extraction or in a manner to depreciate the land as a building site.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) A loan was sanctioned for the purchase of a piece of land which includes that referred to in the Question. The land, which is freehold, was conveyed to the guardians free from any restrictive covenants whatsoever.

Recouped Poor Relief and Old Age Pensions.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a person who is in receipt of Poor Law relief from the guardians, the amount of which relief is entirely recouped to the guardians by the relatives of such person, is, on the ground of the receipt of poor relief, disqualified under Section 3 of the Old-Age Pensions Act, 1908, for receiving an old-age pension; whether, in calculating the means of married couples under subsection (2) of Section 4 of the Act, the pension officers are entitled, in those cases where the wife possesses no means whatsoever, to bring in half the amount of the weekly wage earned by the husband for the purpose of calculating the means of the wife; whether the course adopted by the pension officers is correct when they take the full wage of a workman for the purpose of depriving him of his right to a pension and then take half of the same wage for the purpose of reducing the wife's claim for a pension; and, if the view adopted by the pension officer is correct, whether the Government will forthwith take steps to sweep away this anomaly.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The first part of the Question is among the points upon which I am awaiting the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown. The procedure in cases to which the second and third parts of the Question relate is governed by subsections (1) and (2) of Section 4 of the Old-Age Pensions Act, 1908. The effect of these enactments is that the means of a person being one of a married couple living together in the same house are calculated in precisely the same way as the means of a person who is not married, viz., at the amount received or enjoyed by him or her individually, with this exception, that the means of such a person cannot be taken as being less than half the joint means of the couple. Thus if the means of a husband are £50 a year and the means of the wife are *nil*, the husband's means are to be taken at £50 a year and the wife's at not less than £25 a year. The Government are not proposing to amend this provision.

Widows of Foreigners and Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a widow of a foreign subject, although she has never been out of this country, is disqualified for receiving an old-age pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Answer is in the affirmative, unless the claimant has subsequently recovered her British nationality by naturalisation and resided in the United Kingdom for at least twenty years since such naturalisation.

Territorial Target Practice.

Colonel LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended to give prizes or other rewards for efficiency in shooting to members of the national Territorial Forces, or in any way to encourage target practice by the rank and file of these forces.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The grants to associations are calculated to allow of expenditure in giving prizes for rifle shooting, in the same way as expenditure was permissible under the Vounteer conditions.

Territorial Officers' Medals.

Sir FRANCIS LAYLAND-BARRATT (Devonshire, Torquay): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers of the Territorial Forces are eligible for the grant of the Territorial Force efficiency medal; if so, whether a Territorial officer is entitled to reckon half the time he has served in the ranks as qualifying service for the award of such efficiency medal; and whether, if an officer of the Territorial Forces has received the Territorial efficiency medal, he is thereby debarred from receiving in the future the long-service medal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A Territorial officer is awarded a decoration, not a medal, for long and meritorious service; and service in the ranks reckons towards the qualifying service at the rate of half the time so served. The conditions for the grant of this decoration were published in Army Order 268 of this month.

Poona Officers' Houses.

Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state whether officers in native regiments at Poona, in India, have been inhabiting houses where rats had died of plague; whether these houses were vacated in order to have the flooring repaired; and whether, when the officers returned from camp, they found the flooring in exactly the same state as before, although they pay over £40 a year rent for the lodging; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The Secretary of State has not received any information from India regarding the condition of the houses occupied by officers of the native regiments at Poona. These are private houses rented by officers, and if there is any complaint of their being in an insanitary condition it would be dealt with by the cantonment authority under the Cantonments Act.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Diadem"—Shipwright's Death from Enteric Fever,

Mr. JENKINS (Chatham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can now state what reply is to be given to the application for compassionate allowance made by the widow of the shipwright who was engaged on H.M.S. "Diadem" at Chatham Dockyard, and died from enteric fever.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): A compassionate grant of £10 will be made.

Mr. JENKINS: In consideration of the fact that this workman contracted the disease which caused his death while working in a very unhealthy confined space on this ship, cannot the right hon. Gentleman see his way to give a greater compassionate allowance?

MR. McKENNA: The Board of Admiralty do not admit the facts stated by the hon. Member.

MR. JENKINS: But did not the inquiry prove the case to a certain extent?

MR. McKENNA: I do not admit that was the result of the inquiry.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is it not the case that on the morning of the inquiry special workmen were employed in cleaning out the ship prior to the arrival of the inspectors?

MR. McKENNA: There is no evidence at all that the disease was contracted by this man on board this ship.

Portland Naval Recreation Ground.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): On behalf of the hon. Member for South West Ham, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that a number of sailors were sent ashore recently at Portland to do labourers' work on the naval recreation ground, which has usually been done by ordinary general labourers; and, in consequence of hundreds of men being out of employment there, whether he is prepared to stop such work being done by sailors.

MR. McKENNA: The recreation ground has been largely made by the employment of fleet labour over a long period, and no sufficient provision has been made in the Estimates to permit of the work being done otherwise. It is not proposed to make any change in the practice in such cases.

Naval Building Contracts.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can now state the number of vessels of the different types that have been placed in the hands of the builders, specifying the names of the firms; and, in view of the numbers of workers unemployed, will he use his influence with the firms to expedite the work on hand.

MR. McKENNA: The whole of the orders have not yet been placed, although it is expected that the remaining vessels will be ordered very shortly. In view of this fact, it is not desirable at present to give the names of the firms. I understand that the firms will expedite the work as much as possible, in view of their anxiety to give employment to their men.

MR. WILKIE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us a definition of the word "shortly"?

MR. McKENNA: I hope to-morrow.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Will the firms be allowed to expedite those vessels to any extent they wish?

MR. McKENNA: We are always willing to take the vessels as soon as the firms are ready to hand them over to us. We do not pay extra on that account.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): Has work been commenced on any of the contract vessels mentioned in the Question?

MR. McKENNA: I should like notice of that Question.

Dundee as a Naval Base.

MR. WILKIE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can now state whether he has received the Report of his officials who have visited Dundee with regard to the suitability of Dundee as a base for submarines; if so, whether the report is favourable to the adoption of Dundee for such a purpose; and, in view of the prevailing unemployment, whether he will consider the advisability of making an early commencement with the necessary work connected therewith.

MR. McKENNA: The report in question has been received and is under consideration, and a decision will be reached at the earliest possible date. It cannot be said that the utilisation of a dock or basin at Dundee by vessels that might happen to be there can materially reduce the present unemployment, as no works are contemplated by the Admiralty at Dundee.

Dockyard Establishments.

MR. JENKINS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the number of workmen employed in His Majesty's dockyards at the end of 1906, and the number employed at the present time.

MR. McKENNA: The numbers borne at the end of 1906 were, 27,346. The numbers borne on the 7th November, 1908, were 32,984.

Dockyard Employees' Petitions.

MR. JENKINS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state when the replies will be given to the petitions which were presented in June last by the various grades and trades of workmen employed in His Majesty's dockyards.

MR. McKENNA: It is anticipated that it will be possible to announce the replies to the large number of petitions which have been presented this year by the various classes of dockyard employees some time in February next.

Greenock Torpedo Factory.

MR. BOWERMAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that, at the Government Torpedo Factory, Greenock, about forty masons have been suspended from work for an indefinite period; and whether he will inquire into the matter, with a view to reinstating these men, and so to that extent relieving the state of unemployment now prevailing in Greenock.

MR. McKENNA: The Admiralty have let this work to contract. Unless we are of opinion that the contractor will fail to carry out his obligations, for which we have at present no grounds, we are not in a position to interfere with the contractor's discretion.

Peterhead Harbour of Refuge.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that at the Admiralty works in connection with the National Harbour of Refuge, Peterhead, several batches of workmen have been dismissed; whether he will state the reason for these dismissals; and whether he will have the discharged workmen reinstated and also have as many men employed on the works as possible in view of the present state of unemployment.

MR. McKENNA: It is the invariable custom at Peterhead Harbour Works to discharge workmen when the weather conditions prevent certain work being continued. I am glad to say, however, that the discharges this year have been fewer than usual. The work is intended chiefly to be carried out by convict labour. It is not feasible to employ more free labour at this time of year.

MR. CURRAN: Why is convict labour used at this time of unemployment to the disadvadvantage of the honest industrial artisan?

MR. McKENNA: Convict labour is employed because it is very desirable to give the convicts something to do.

Reform of Indian Administration.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to state whether any announcement of the measures of reform in India which are foreshadowed in His Majesty's gracious proclamation will be made to the House during the present session.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The Secretary of State expects to be in a position to make a statement before the end of the session.

SIR H. COTTON: Cannot the hon. Gentleman give me a more definite Answer?

MR. BUCHANAN: I have answered the Question on the Paper.

Alleged Police Corruption in India.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the revelations of police corruption and perjury at Midnapur and elsewhere in India, and of the effect of this in bringing Courts of law into contempt amongst the natives, it is proposed to cause a searching inquiry to be made into this and similar cases.

I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can communicate to the House the facts concerning the collapse of the conspiracy case at Midnapur; whether the chief witness in the prosecution stated in the Court that his former evidence had been a concoction given at the instigation of the police; whether the charge against the accused was thereupon withdrawn; whether the Rajah of Narajole and twenty-three others, many of them leading citizens of Midnapur, were discharged; whether he can say how long these men had been kept in prison on a false charge; and what compensation it is proposed to pay them.

MR. BUCHANAN: I will answer the hon. Member's two Questions on this subject together. On the 9th November twenty-two of the accused in the Midnapur conspiracy case were released after periods of detention averaging about a month. The informer who was the principal witness against them retracted his former statements, which he said had been elicited by threats and promises on the part of the police. There are three prisoners still under trial. When the judicial proceedings are concluded full inquiry will, no doubt, be made by the local Government into this case. It is not proposed to pay compensation to the accused who have been discharged. I may add that there was a comprehensive review of police administration in 1902.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Were these accused arrested on the strength of the concocted evidence of these so-called informers, and does not a claim for compensation therefore arise?

MR. BUCHANAN: I do not quite understand the word "claim," but I gather from the newspapers that one or more of these men who were prisoners will raise an action in the Courts.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): May I ask whether the police who were guilty of corruption and perjury in this case were Europeans or natives of India; and, if the latter, whether admiration for native methods of administration can logically stop short of approval of native police methods?

SIR H. COTTON: Are these three prisoners still on trial the three men who were informers in the first instance?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am not aware; I should like notice of that.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Will the hon. Gentleman cause a searching inquiry to be made into this and similar cases?

MR. BUCHANAN: The hon. Gentleman assumes guilt in a large number of cases which are not yet proved. With regard to the general investigation as to the conduct of the police, such an investigation was held a very few years ago, and the Secretary of State does not propose to institute another general inquiry.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that during the last twelve months there have been four cases almost identical with the one here referred to, and does not that justify an inquiry of some kind?

MR. BUCHANAN: The hon. Member must not assume that in this particular case the allegations are proved.

*MR. REES: Were the police concerned Europeans or natives of India?

MR. BUCHANAN: I think they were natives of India.

SIR H. COTTON: Is it the fact that the principal informer in this case who retracted his confession said he did so under the influence of torture by the police?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am not aware of that.

Indian Railway Contracts with Belgium.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India if he can inform the House whether any bounty or bonus was offered by the Belgian authorities to the firm which recently secured a contract for screws required for the Government railways of India.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has no knowledge whether the Belgian firm referred to is in the receipt of any bounties from the Belgian Government.

Sedition in Bengal.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the sedition which prevails in Bengal, the Government will postpone the announcement of measures of reform in India till after the conclusion of the present session.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer that I have just given to the hon. Member for East Nottingham is, I think, at the same time a sufficient answer to this Question.

Indian Government and the Suppression of Sedition.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India proposes to take any steps in order to strengthen its own hands for the suppression of sedition and the punishment of crime.

MR. BUCHANAN: The question is under the consideration of the Government of India. The Secretary of State is unable at present to make any statement on the subject.

Treatment of Indian Geological Students.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a number of students of geology from the Presidency College, Calcutta, went for practical training to the Singhbhum district under Professor Das Gupta, and at Chaibasa were taken by Mr. Carey, the district magistrate, for a band of Anarchists, and, despite the explanation of the professor as to the purpose of the students, a cordon of police was placed round the Zilla school, and the names, addresses and thumb prints of the students demanded; and whether, in view of the fact that every year these students make a short tour during the Poojah recess for practical training at the expense of the Government, he will suggest to the Government the necessity of the district magistrates in particular being informed of the practice of the Presidency College respecting its students, so that such annoyance and disgrace may not again be perpetrated.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has no knowledge of the incident referred to. If the facts are as stated, the college authorities will no doubt, take whatever action is necessary.

Naval Visits to the Colonies.

SIR JOHN RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office has been made aware of the gratification consequent on the visit of a portion of the Fleet to South Africa; is the advantage of visits to British Dominions over the sea of ships of His Majesty's Navy being considered by the Colonial Office; and, if not, will they endeavour to arrange with the Admiralty for such visits from time to time as may be deemed desirable in the interest of the Empire.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State is well aware of the gratification with which the visit of the second cruiser squadron to Durban has been received in South Africa, and he fully appreciates the advantages of periodical visits to the Dominions of ships of His Majesty's Navy. The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty share his views on the matter but the visits must necessarily be subject to the exigencies of the service.

Alleged Flogging of Zulus.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have any information respecting the progress of the investigation which, on 18th September last, Sir M. Nathan reported to be then proceeding into the allegations that had been made by Miss Colenso as to the flogging of Zulus; and has the attention of the Secretary of State been called to the letters which were addressed by her to the Natal officials on this subject, dated 3rd September, 3rd, 5th, and 20th ultimo, in the last of which she represents its urgency to the Attorney-General of

Natal, on the ground that the recent thrashings and threatenings of Zulus under martial law have a vital bearing on much of the alleged evidence against Dinizulu.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir. I regret that I am not at present in a position to add anything to the information given in the last Blue-book, Cd. 4328, but further inquiry shall be made of the Governor by cable.

Protection of Indian Subjects in Natal.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the case of an employer of Indian indentured labour in Natal, named Armitage, who last month was convicted of knocking down one of his coolies, jumping upon him, and deliberately cutting off the lobe of his right ear with a penknife; whether he is aware that the defendant justified his action by pleading that the Government allowed the cutting of sheep's ears, and that the penalty imposed was a fine of £20; and what steps His Majesty's Ministers propose to take to secure a more efficient protection of His Majesty's Indian subjects domiciled in Natal but unrepresented in the Parliament of that Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: I have seen a short account of this case in the Press, which does not give all the details contained in the Question, but I have no official information as to its accuracy. The Secretary of State has, of course, no power to interfere with the sentences of the Courts, but as it is alleged that the prisoner was an employer of indentured labour, he is making inquiry of the Natal Government with regard to the case.

Southern Nigerian Imports of Spirits.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if spirits are imported into Southern Nigeria from the United Kingdom and from Germany on the same terms of payment of duty; and if they can be imported into German East Africa and into the Cameroons on the same equal terms.

COLONEL SEELY: The answer to both parts of the Question is in the affirmative.

Straits Settlements Opium Commission.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Report of the Opium Commission of the Straits Settlements has yet been received at the Colonial Office; and if he is prepared to make it public.

COLONEL SEELY: The Report has not yet been received.

Opium Traffic in Hong Kong.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received from the Governor of Hong Kong his proposals for dealing with the opium traffic there; and whether anything has yet been actually done by way of suppressing the opium dens there, as called for by His Majesty's Government in their telegram of May last.

COLONEL SEELY: Further investigation has led the Governor to modify his proposals, and I understand that his final recommendations are now on their way. Meanwhile it has not been possible to take action.

Hong Kong Budget.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the Annual Budget of Hong-Kong for the coming year, introduced in September last, any provision whatever was made to take the place of revenue hitherto coming from the opium dens there.

COLONEL SEELY: No, Sir; the Colonial Government could hardly be expected to take the action suggested pending the consideration of the Governor's proposals, which are, as I have explained already, on their way.

Trial by Jury in Rhodesia.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that an attempt

Universities Bill or the Small Holdings Act, which must necessarily add to the expenditure. When the question of elementary education is settled, and I suppose all of us hope that a reasonable settlement of that question may be arrived at before long, a further large charge will undoubtedly be imposed on the Exchequer. Then there are other more important items of increased expenditure to which we may look forward, first in Army services. Unless the rumours which have been abroad within the last few weeks as to intended reductions in the Army are true, as I cannot imagine for a moment they are, and if the Territorial Army scheme is a success, very considerable additions must be made to the Army Estimates in the coming years on that account, especially in order to establish the Territorial Artillery. Then those who are acquainted with the needs of the services tell us that both in the Army and Navy, stores have been depleted in the last two years which will have to be replaced in future years. Lastly, the new construction vote for the Navy for three years running has been reduced to a point which has been unknown for many years previously, with the certain result that if the promises of the Government with regard to the maintenance of our Navy in an effective state are realised the new construction vote must be increased in the years before us, probably by several millions.

In addition to those charges there are two important permanent naval works—the docks and harbour at Rosyth and the Portsmouth lock—for which a sum of no more than £100,000 is taken in the Estimates of the present year, but for the completion of which at least £4,500,000 will be needed. We have been told that the works at Rosyth are to take ten years. If the policy of spending money at Rosyth is sound, and I believe it to be necessary, there can be no question that these works ought to be brought to a conclusion at the earliest possible date. I believe at the present moment there is not a single naval dockyard on the whole east coast of this country capable of receiving a ship of the "Dreadnought" class. If by postponing the execution of this great work owing to their desire to keep down naval Estimates, that work should be found to be not ready in the event of a possible naval war in the North Sea, a responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the Government which I should be sorry to bear. Taking all these matters together, and remembering that the Government have set their faces against loans, I believe a sum of several millions must be added to the ordinary annual peace Estimates during the next few years.

That is not all. We have now before us the Old-Age Pensions Bill, which will impose a burden commencing at £7,500,000 or so, and extending to an amount which no man can foresee, upon the finances of the country. What has been the policy which the Government have pursued with a view to preparing for this great increase? We have been told by the Prime Minister that he budgeted not merely for one year, but that his Budgets form part of the whole of a great financial policy. Last year he gave up £3,500,000 of indirect taxation in the shape of coal duty and reduction of the tea duty. This year he follows that action up by giving up £3,500,000 of the sugar duty—£7,000,000 of indirect taxation given up in two years with these great liabilities before us.

I have never contended, and am not about to contend now, that either the coal duty or the sugar duty is free from objection. I defy any man to discover a tax against which no objections can be made. Least of all can that be said for the income-tax, the high rate of which is certain to have a direct effect upon the employment of the people and upon the condition of trade. But what I have contended is that, granting that there are objections to the coal tax and the sugar tax, just as there must be objections to every kind of tax, it would be absolutely impossible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to raise the amount which those taxes have produced with less disturbance to the general trade and industry of the country, and with less injurious effects upon the masses of the people. I have no doubt that the repeal of the coal duty benefited the employers and workmen concerned in the production of coal. It did not benefit them to the

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: The claim for compensation which His Majesty's Government presented to the Uruguayan Government on behalf of the owners of the "Agnes Donohoe" was rejected by the former in May, 1907. As the "Agnes Donohoe" is a Canadian vessel, His Majesty's Government have throughout consulted the Canadian Government in dealing with the question, and they are at present awaiting the views of the Dominion Government on the situation created by the Uruguayan Government in refusing to entertain a claim for compensation. His Majesty's Government do not propose to take any further action in the matter without the concurrence of the Dominion.

International Commission on Opium.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what are the terms of Reference of the International Commission on Opium which is to meet in Shanghai in January next; and whether the inquiry will cover the use of morphia and cocaine.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: The terms of reference are still under consideration, but they will be communicated as promised to the hon. Member as soon as they have been definitely settled.

Mr. THEODORE TAYLOR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is intended to invite to join the International Commission on Opium any other Powers besides Great Britain, the United States, France, Germany, Holland, Portugal, China, and Japan.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: Besides the Powers mentioned by the hon. Member, Russia, Turkey, Persia, and Siam have been invited to join the Commission.

Weekly Rest Days.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any inquiry has been made, in accordance with an undertaking given by Earl Beauchamp on 23rd June, as to what legislation in other countries has taken place on Sunday labour or a weekly day of rest; and, if so, will he make known the result of the inquiry by either publishing the correspondence or making a Report to the House.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: His Majesty's representatives in certain foreign countries were instructed last July to report on the subject. The correspondence will be published as soon as all the information asked for has been received.

Mr. C. E. PRICE: When may we expect it?

*Mr. McKINNON WOOD: We are only waiting for the reply from the United States.

Venezuela.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as to the losses sustained by the British community at Trinidad through the closing of the Venezuelan ports.

Mr. McKINNON WOOD: The unsatisfactory position of commercial relations with Venezuela has for some time past occupied the attention of His Majesty's Government and of His Majesty's Minister in Caracas, and the latter has adopted, and may be relied on to adopt, any practicable measures to improve matters. We cannot, however, hold out much hope that these efforts will be immediately successful.

Licensing Commissioners.

Mr. G. D. FABER (York): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the pledge given on behalf of His Majesty's Government during the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill that the names of the three Licensing Commissioners proposed to be appointed should be announced on the Report stage of the Bill, he will now make the announcement.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. The following are the names approved by His Majesty: The Right

Hon. Henry Hobhouse, to be Chairman of the Commission, and Mr. Arthur W. Chapman, J.P., and Mr. F. H. Mellor, K.C., to be members.

Small Holdings in Dorsetshire.

*Mr. WILLS (Dorsetshire, N.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the Dorset County Council have decided that as regards obtaining land for small local holdings they will negotiate to meet such needs by voluntary agreement, but are not prepared to apply for compulsory powers (except in exceptional cases) where in their opinion the sub-division of land would seriously damage the value of existing holdings; and whether, in view of the demand in Dorset for land in the neighbourhood of the applicants' residences, and the fact that this demand cannot be satisfied without interfering with existing holdings, the Board of Agriculture will take any steps to prevent the failure of the Act in that county.

*The TREASURER of the HOUSEHOLD (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.): The Board are informed that the policy of the county council is substantially as stated. The council expect, however, to obtain sufficient land by voluntary agreement to satisfy the demands of all suitable applicants, and I can assure my hon. friend that the Board will not fail to take any necessary action if there is any undue delay on the part of the county council.

*Mr. WILLS: Are not this county council now refusing many applications on the sole ground that there is no vacant land?

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: I am not aware of that.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): If the Board are satisfied that the county council are not doing their duty, will it take steps to compel them to do so?

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): Arising out of that reply, whatever it was, will the Government consider the propriety of furnishing the Treasury bench with a megaphone?

[No Answer was returned.]

Dorset Co-operative Small Holdings Associations.

*Mr. WILLS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that at Sturminster Newton and Marnhull, in Dorset, co-operative small holdings associations have been formed upon the financial basis and under the rules approved by the Board of Agriculture, and that these associations have applied for land to the Dorset County Council repeatedly without response, the last application being dated 17th August, although suitable vacant land exists or has existed in the neighbourhood of each place during the period covered by the said applications; and whether the Board of Agriculture propose to take any steps in the matter.

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: We have been in communication with the county council, and we are informed that they are now negotiating for the acquisition of a farm of 235 acres at Sturminster Newton with a view to sub-letting it to the Sturminster Newton Association. With regard to the Marnhull Association, the county council are in communication with the association with reference to its financial position.

*Mr. WILLS: Have the county council left unanswered the application of the association for over three months, and are they not repeating questions which the association has already answered, so far as it can be expected to do so?

*Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The information that I have is that the association has not up till now satisfied the county council as to its financial position.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Have the county council given any indication when it is likely its inquiry will come to a definite conclusion?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: They inform me they will act as soon as they are satisfied with the result of the inquiry.

MR. JOHN WARD: And they have been saying that ever since the Act was passed.

*MR. WILLS: Has not the application of this association been before the county council for over three months, and have not the questions now being asked already been answered, so far as such an association can reasonably be expected to answer them? Is there any definite complaint as to any portion of the answers?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think notice should be given of some of these Questions.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): Will the Board of Agriculture call upon the county council to furnish it with a copy of the correspondence with the association so that it may judge if the county council is attempting to do its duty?

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Certainly.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): Will the Board recommend to the authority the advisability of putting into force the compulsory powers of the Act?

*MR. SPEAKER: That Question has already been answered.

Black Scab Potato Disease.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the black scab potato disease can be introduced into a district by the purchase of affected seed; and, if so, what steps are being taken by the Board to warn growers accordingly.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Board are doing all they can by the issue of a leaflet and by visits of inspectors, to bring to the notice of growers the danger of purchasing affected seed.

MR. R. HARCOURT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, in what counties in England and Scotland the black scab potato disease is known to exist; what steps have been taken by the Board, since the order of 18th June last making the disease a notifiable one, for the purpose either of lessening the area of infection or of checking its spread.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The wart diseases of potatoes is known to exist in the following counties of England and Scotland: Berkshire, Cheshire, Cumberland, Derbyshire, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Salop, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Yorkshire, Ayr, Clackmannan, Dumfries, Dumbarton, Fife, Perth, Stirling. The Board have sent their leaflet on the disease to those concerned. The leaflet explains the causes of infection and the preventive and remedial measures to be adopted. Their inspectors have also visited the affected districts and have taken all possible steps to bring to the notice of growers the nature of the disease and warned them of the results of neglecting the remedial and preventive measures recommended by the Board.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. ROWLANDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether nurserymen and growers who have gooseberry bushes affected with the American gooseberry mildew have recently been allowed to move or sell such bushes after they have been pruned but have received no other treatment; if so, in how many cases and in what counties this has been permitted; and whether any Memorandum has been issued by the Board on the subject of the conditions under which diseased bushes may be moved or sold.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Gooseberry bushes that have been affected with the disease mentioned can only be removed on a licence of an inspector who has examined and declared them free from disease. In no case has such a licence been granted for removal to premises outside an infected area. No Memorandum on this subject has been issued, but full information is supplied to any one asking permission to remove bushes. Only a few such licences have been issued at present in the Isle of Ely and Kent.

Horse Poisoning at Wellington, Salop.

MR. STANIER (Shropshire, Newport): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if the Board can now give a report as to the cause of death of the seven horses, the property of Mr. John Parton, of Bennett's Bank, Wellington, Salop, in July last; and, if so, will he supply the report.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: From inquiry made there seems no doubt that the horses died from poisoning, but it has not been ascertained how they came in contact with the poisonous substance. I shall be happy to show the hon. Member a copy of our inspector's Report on the matter.

Contagious Mammitis at Wirral.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the recent outbreak of contagious mammitis at Wirral, in Cheshire; and whether the Board are going to schedule the disease under the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, as the outbreak has created much alarm in the district.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board made full inquiry into this outbreak, but on the information available they are not prepared to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member.

MR. STANIER: Seeing that thirty horses died, is there no grave danger for the whole district and ought not the Board of Agriculture to take immediate action?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am informed by our experts that there is not the danger which the hon. Member appears to fear.

Black Scab in England.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been called to the way in which the Irish Board of Agriculture are now dealing with the outbreaks of black scab in Ireland; and, seeing that this disease is worse in Great Britain, if similar action can be undertaken in Great Britain.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board have so far only seen newspaper reports as to the methods adopted in Ireland, but they are obtaining official information on the subject, and will then consider whether action on similar lines would be practicable in Great Britain.

MR. STANIER: Cannot the hon. Gentleman see and read the Irish Order, and cannot he realise that if with only two cases in Ireland they are thus able to tackle the disease in a most effective manner, the example is one he should follow?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter for argument.

Tuberculous Milk in London.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that out of ninety-two samples of milk sampled by the officials of the London County Council last week, 23·9 per cent. were found to be tuberculous; and what steps, if any, the Government propose to take to deal with the disease.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board have seen a copy of the Report of the public health committee of the London County Council to which my hon. friend is perhaps referring. It would appear that the samples examined were taken at various times during the last quarter. The Board are carefully considering whether they can take any action to deal with the matter.

Small Holdings in Shropshire.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that the Shropshire County Council have decided to hire certain land on lease for the purpose of small holdings and to borrow and spend £500 for providing buildings, dairies, etc.; if he will state in what number of years the loan must be repaid; if the interest on such loan and the sinking fund for the repayment thereof are included in the rent to be paid by the small holders; and to whom the buildings will belong when the land reverts to the owner.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Shropshire County Council have agreed to rent 160 acres for thirty five years and propose to spend £350 on alteration of existing buildings. The term of the loan will be fixed by the Local Government Board, but no doubt they will have regard to the life of the improvement. The rent must be fixed to cover all expenses. The buildings will belong to the owner when the land reverts to him.

Small Holding Co-operative Societies.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state the names of the four small holdings co-operative societies which have been formed; in what localities they exist; whether they are formed for the joint cultivation of the land by the members themselves or are syndicates founded for the purpose of acquiring land by sale or hire from county councils and sub-letting the same to small holders; and, if the latter, whether he will state the rules of such societies as regards capital, shares, profits, etc., and whether such rules have been approved by the Board of Agriculture.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The four co-operative societies to whom land has been let are those at Mere in Wiltshire, Biggleswade in Bedfordshire, and Clipston and Rushden in Northamptonshire. The rules of the societies have been approved by the Board. The nominal capital of the associations is equal to three years rent of the land let to them. The societies are formed for the purpose of acquiring land from county councils and letting it to their members in small holdings. I shall be happy to send the right hon. Member a copy of the model form of rules approved by the Board.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Is there any limit to the profit which these middlemen may make out of these holdings by charging extra rent?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, it is limited to 5 per cent.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Which the tenants have to pay.

Small Holdings in Gloucestershire.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the attention of the Board of Agriculture has been drawn to the fact that in the Return of Holdings [Cd. 3408] issued by the Board in 1907 the number of small holdings therein stated to be existing in Gloucestershire is 6,585, whereas in a Return issued by the Gloucestershire County Council in December, 1907, the number of existing small holdings in the county is stated to be 12,363; whether the Board are aware that the county council Return has been carefully checked by independent persons; and whether he can state what steps the Board are taking to rectify such a gross error in their Return respecting this particular county, and similar errors that presumably exist in the Returns relating to other counties.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The basis of the two Returns is entirely different. The Board's Return represents holdings of agricultural land in one occupation whereas in the county council's Return a holding is a "separate assessment of land." Careful inquiry into the matter at the request of the Board has been made by the Inland Revenue Commissioners with the result that there is no reason to question the accuracy of the official Returns.

Foot and Mouth Disease in Pennsylvania.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) asked the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he had received reports of a serious outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Pennsylvania, and whether he proposed to take any action with regard to imports of hay and straw into Ireland.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): Yes, Sir. The intelligence of this outbreak was communicated to me by telegram to-day, and I have authorised the issue of an order to take effect on the 21st inst., prohibiting the importation of hay, straw, or fodder into Ireland from the United States.

MR. HICKS BEACH inquired whether the English Board of Agriculture had received the same information, and whether they proposed to take similar steps.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board of Agriculture received information on Monday that there was an outbreak in Pennsylvania, ninety head of cattle being affected, and a subsequent telegram on the same day, saying the outbreak was on fourteen farms in four counties, affecting 230 animals, of which number, 200 had been destroyed. The Board took immediate steps, and issued an Order on the 18th inst. The effect of that Order was to prohibit the landing in Great Britain of animals, or of hay and straw if used as fodder or litter, brought from Pennsylvania as from the 21st inst., and special steps will be taken to deal with the cargoes of animals already on the high seas.

Timber Denudation of Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that during the last six months the railway stations at Hollymount and Ballinrobe have been crowded with timber from the estates of Colonel Knox and Mr. Fitzpatrick, and that last year thousands of tons of wood were despatched from Claremorris station from the estate of Lord Oranmore; and whether the Department will take any steps by legislation or otherwise to prevent the West of Ireland from being denuded of timber in this way.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The Department has neither legislative powers nor other means of dealing with the difficulty.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked if the Government would not take steps to prevent landlords cutting down the timber in this year?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Representations on the subject are receiving attention.

Black Scab in Irish Potatoes.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he will give the names of the places where black scab in potatoes has broken out in Ireland.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The only places in Ireland where black scab in potatoes has been found are Kilkeel on the south coast of County Down, two cases, and the southern end of the Ards Peninsula on the east of the same county, one case.

MR. STANIER inquired if seed potatoes were sent from these places to England.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I do not think any come from County Down. There is a seed potato trade between Derry and Armagh.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Is it not the fact that the crops in which this disease has been found are very small crops, and that this year's Irish potato crop is the best for ten years past?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes. The disease was found in one plot owned by the Coastguard, and in another it was found in a garden.

Liscannor Harbour.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Harbour of Liscannor is still unfinished and is filling with up silt, etc., thereby preventing ships of large size entering; will he get the Board of Works to keep their promise of February last, viz. to get the works completed as soon as possible; and whether he is aware that an engineer has been at Liscannor for the past two years without doing work for the benefit of the harbour.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to Questions for him to-day. I am informed by the Board of Works that the harbour at Liscannor is not yet finished, but the Board have just completed negotiations with the representatives of the contractor, and are now prepared to commence operations themselves. A clerk of works was necessarily resident at the harbour pending the completion of the negotiations. The harbour has a tendency to fill with silt, and will have to be kept clear by manual labour. There have been difficulties with the contractor who failed to complete the necessary works in accordance with his contract, but the silting has not been affected by the failure of the contractor to complete his work.

Intimidation at Riverstown.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Riverstown branch of the United Irish League has instituted a reign of terror, intimidation, and boycotting, directed against the Protestant minority in that neighbourhood; that they are refused the bare necessaries of life, their horses cannot be shod, their milk cannot be conveyed to the creameries, they cannot obtain labourers to work the land or herds to guard their cattle; and whether, seeing that appeals made to the Executive for protection have proved futile, he will say what steps he proposes to take to safeguard the lives and property of the law-abiding Protestant minority in the Riverstown district.

MR. CHERRY: The statements in the Question are a somewhat exaggerated account of the boycotting which, according to my information, recently prevailed in the neighbourhood referred to. A prosecution has been instituted, and I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the reply given by my right hon. frend the Chief Secretary to a similar Question asked yesterday by the hon. Member for Mid Armagh.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: At whose suit was the prosecution instituted?

MR. CHERRY: At the suit of the Government, on my direction.

United Irish League and Evicted Tenants.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give particulars of dissatisfaction among local evicted tenants in cases where the Estates Commissioners have allocated farms to transplanted evicted tenants; how many such instances have occurred; and whether he will take steps to secure that persons nominated by the United Irish League shall not receive preferential treatment in being reinstated.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners are not in a position to give the information asked for in the first part of the Question. There is no ground for the suggestion that persons nominated by the United Irish League receive preferential treatment.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Can the right hon. Gentleman cite a single instance in which any one not nominated by the United Irish League got a farm?

MR. CHERRY: I do not know anybody who received a farm anywhere.

Riverstown Riot.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state with how many rifles and rifle cartridges were the police at Riverstown armed on the night they shot John Stenson dead; how many rifle shots and how many other shots did they fire at the people on that occasion; who gave the order to fire; was any public notice given in advance to the people that if they attempted to scatter the cattle off Mr. Phibbs's ranch they would be shot down with rifle bullets; was the Riot Act read aloud to the people before the police began to fire; if it is in accordance with the rules of the Royal Irish Constabulary to lie in ambush and fire with rifles upon trespassers on a ranch, killing one of them, without having given any previous notice or read the Riot Act; and what law do the police rely upon to justify this action.

The following Questions also on the same subject appeared on the Paper in the hon. Gentleman's name.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any evidence, beyond the uncorroborated assertions of the police, that the people at Riverstown, County Sligo, used firearms on 29th October last; and whether, for instance, any policeman has sustained a shot wound.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the sergeant of police at Riverstown boasted repeatedly during the week preceding the shooting of John Stenson that the police had orders to shoot cattle-drivers on sight, without reading the Riot Act, and that he would pump lead into the people; and, if this conduct is not in accordance with the discipline of the force and the wishes of the Government, what action is to be taken in the matter.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the fact of the police having taken a human life at Riverstown, County Sligo, on 29th October last is the only undisputed statement in the police report of that occurrence, and that the police are therefore interested parties and the only persons opposed to an exhaustive inquiry, the Government will institute such an inquiry forthwith.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if any post-mortem examination of the body of John Stenson was made before the inquest; if so, by whom was it made, and what are his qualifications; was it ascertained or given in evidence whether or not death is instantaneous when a rifle bullet enters the back of the head, passes through the head, and emerges through one of the eyes; and what verdict was returned at the inquest.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it was with the sanction of the Irish Government that the Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, on learning on 29th October last that the police at Riverstown, County Sligo, had shot a man dead, telegraphed to the district inspector at Ballymote to inform Head Constable Donovan and the men who, under his charge, repelled the attack on the police of an armed party of cattle-drivers on the morning of 29th instant, and added that he was grateful to learn how well they upheld the traditions of the force on that occasion; and, seeing that this telegram from the head of the force is, and until countermanded will be, an incentive to all policemen to act similarly, whether the Government will immediately convey to the police disapproval of the telegram in question and of the spilling of human blood by peace officers.

MR. CHERRY: As regards the principal matters referred to in this and the five following Questions, I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to the Questions asked by the hon. Members for North Sligo and Mid Armagh on the 5th instant. That reply was as follows: "On the occasion in question, shortly after midnight, a force of ten police under a head constable, was on certain lands from which the cattle had twice been driven. A body of over 100 men entered the field and approached the cattle. They refused to retire when called on to do so, and attacked the police with stones. The head constable in charge of the party was struck on the head with a stone and knocked down, and other constables were also injured. A shot was fired from the crowd, and the police were driven back by volleys of stones. The crowd rapidly closed on the police, and the head constable, believing the lives of his men to be in imminent danger, ordered them to fire. The crowd repeatedly fired at the police with revolvers, and did not retire until the police had fired a second and third time. The dead body of a young man, named

John Stenson, was subsequently found in the field with a bullet wound in the head. These facts speak for themselves. An inquest has been held, and it is not intended to hold any further inquiry." Eighteen carbine shots and five revolver shots were fired by the police in self-defence. The police are not empowered to read the Riot Act; that is the duty in proper cases of a magistrate. The statement of the police as to the circumstances in which they fired was given on oath at the inquest, and no one came forward to contradict it. So far as I am aware, no one was present on the occasion except the police and the rioters, and it is, therefore, impossible to secure any independent evidence, but that of the police themselves. The necessary medical evidence was given by the local dispensary doctor, who is fully qualified. The verdict was to the effect that death was caused by a bullet wound. The telegram sent by the Inspector-General was a personal message to a head constable injured in the discharge of his duty, and did not require the sanction of the Government. I cannot say whether the hon. Member's account of its contents is accurate or not, but the Government have no reason to think that it will have a bad effect, and have no intention of expressing disapproval of the action of the Inspector-General in sending it. The police authorities inform me that there is no foundation for the charge made against the sergeant at Riverstown.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): A state of war!

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): May I ask whether it is impossible to get any evidence independent of that of the police?

MR. CHERRY: Yes, Sir, it is really impossible, so far as we know. It was the middle of the night, and nobody was present except the police and the rioters.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): Is there the slightest ground for doubting the evidence of the police?

MR. CHERRY: I see none.

MR. GINNELL: Is it not a fact that a branch of the United Irish League has existed in the district of Riverstown for years, and that the district has been perfectly peaceful until last summer, when a branch of an aggressive Protestant organisation was formed there?

MR. CHERRY: I believe a branch of the League has existed in Riverstown, but I do not think you could describe the condition of the locality as peaceful.

Riverstown Grass Ranch.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Phibbs's grass ranch extends to the walls of the village of Riverstown, County Sligo; that Mr. Phibbs is an absentee and gives no employment upon that land; that some of the villagers have no land and some mere gardens; that they are willing, on the ranch being distributed among them, to pay its full value as ascertained by the Land Commission; and whether, in all the circumstances and in the interest of peace in the district, the Government will purchase and distribute that ranch.

MR. CHERRY: I understand that this farm is situated as described. It is in grass and affords no employment. The owner lives about eight miles away. Up to the present he does not appear to have instituted proceedings for sale, but the Estates Commissioners will make inquiries.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the gentleman mentioned in this Question has acted most generously by his neighbours since he succeeded to the property; that he has apportioned grass plots to them on the ordinary local terms from year to year, and that there is no foundation, therefore, for the insinuation in the Question?

MR. CHERRY: I know nothing whatever about Mr. Phibbs. I never heard of him.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is it a proper Question in which intimidatory language is used to compel the Government to purchase and distribute a ranch ?

Mr. CHERRY: That is a matter for Mr. Speaker.

Glencar Evicted Tenants.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, although applications were lodged with the Estates Commissioners last June for the reinstatement of the six tenants who were evicted from their farms on the M'Gillicuddy Eager Estate, Glencar, County Kerry, no action has yet been taken by the Commissioners; and whether, with a view to bringing about a settlement, they will now use their influence with the owners and agent to secure the reinstatement of these tenants.

Mr. CHERRY: The six tenants referred to were evicted since the passing of the Irish Land Act, 1903, and their applications were not received by the Estates Commissioners until 9th September last. Their applications do not, therefore, come within the provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act, but will be inquired into when the estate is being dealt with under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Irish University Charters.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the reason for the delay in issuing the University and College Charters for the new Universities in Ireland.

Mr. CHERRY: The Charters are now substantially ready, and will, I hope, be issued very shortly.

Style Park, Limerick.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John Coleman, a member of the Limerick County Council, has obtained from the Estates Commissioners, or has applied for, a portion of the untenanted lands acquired by them, together with the mansion of Style Park; will he state what is the amount of land already in Mr. Coleman's possession as tenant or hired by him for grazing under the eleven-months system; and, seeing that the transfer to such a tenant of untenanted lands which are required for evicted tenants, labourers, and small holders in the neighbourhood, would be a violation of Clause 2 of the Purchase Act of 1903, will he state what action he proposes to take.

Mr. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners have received an application from John Coleman to be allotted portion of the untenanted land on the Style Park estate of Major Wise, County Limerick. The Commissioners do not know what lands Coleman has in his possession for grazing or otherwise, but will make inquiries before making any allotment of the lands.

Warning to Irish Nationalist Newspaper Proprietors.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the newspapers whose proprietors were recently warned against publishing intimidatory resolutions of United Irish League branches have given an undertaking not to publish such resolutions, or whether they have, in fact, ceased to publish them; and whether any case has yet arisen calling for proceedings to be taken.

Mr. CHERRY: The newspapers referred to in the Question were warned, not asked for an undertaking. It is too soon to say what the result of the warning may be.

Fort Fergus Cattle-Drive.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of an extensive cattle-drive at Fort Fergus, County Clare, on Friday the 13th instant; whether the cattle driven off the lands have been recovered; and whether any persons were arrested or proceeded against in connection with the occurrence.

Mr. CHERRY: The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that 140 cattle, fifty-seven sheep, and three horses, were driven off on this occasion.

MR. LONSDALE: Were any persons arrested?

MR. CHERRY: No. No one saw the drive.

MR. LONSDALE: Have any cattle been recovered?

MR. CHERRY: I hope they will be, but if not, the owner will get compensation for them.

Marlborough Street Training College.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has recommended, or will recommend, the Treasury to make an additional grant for the erection of a residence for women students in connection with the Marlborough Street Training College, Dublin.

MR. CHERRY: The Commissioners of National Education have already received a free grant of £50,000 for the erection of residential quarters at Glasnevin for male and female King's scholars in connection with the Marlborough Street Training College. While regretting that the Commissioners have not been able to provide a residence for the female scholars out of that sum, my right hon. friend is unable to hold out any hope that an additional grant will be made to them for the purpose.

Theft of Cattle in County Clare.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the cattle driven off the lands of Michael Hogan, and for which he obtained a decree of £40 at the Ennis Quarter Sessions, have yet been recovered; and, if not, whether the persons who stole these beasts have been brought to justice.

MR. CHERRY: I have nothing to add to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to a Question on the same subject asked by the hon. Member on 29th October.

MR. LONSDALE: If any person is found who was engaged in stealing these cattle, will he be prosecuted?

MR. CHERRY: Of course; if they are found.

MR. LONSDALE: Have they not been found?

MR. CHERRY: Not that I am aware of. They may have been found without my knowledge.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is it the intention of the Executive to take any action against the leaders of the movement in favour of cattle-driving—whether they be Members of the House or not?

MR. CHERRY: Does the hon. Member seriously suggest that because cattle are stolen in Clare, I should take proceedings against a Member of this House?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: But is it not the fact that Members of this House do recommend cattle-driving?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Order, order. I never stole a cow in my life.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: The hon. Member recommends it, but is afraid to do it himself.

MR. CHERRY: The hon. and gallant Gentleman does not appear to understand that this is a case of cattle-stealing—not cattle-driving.

Traffic in Firearms in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the increase in the number of outrages with firearms reported since the expiry of the Peace Preservation Act, he will cause special inquiries to be made by the police with regard to the extensive traffic in firearms now being carried on in Ireland, and especially with regard to the sale of such weapons upon the instalment plan.

MR. CHERRY: I have nothing to add to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to a noble friend behind me (Lord St. Davids) drew attention to what I believe is by far the most active cause in the continued depreciation of Consols—I mean the opening of Colonial stocks to trustees. I do not agree with him, I need hardly say, in the position I hold, that we should withdraw from the position, but I very much doubt whether at the time that was done, in a rather light-hearted way, it was realised what very serious effects it would have on the money market. Nowadays the proportion of trust funds invested in Consols is extraordinarily small. In regard to marriage settlements, it is almost invariably the rule to invest in other stocks. That, of course, is due to the great variety of other stocks which can be relied upon to produce a somewhat larger interest. Then we are told that we have driven Consols down still further by our old-age pensions scheme. On 6th May Consols stood at 85½; to-day they are just 87. It would be unreasonable, I think, either on one side or the other, to ascribe fluctuations of that kind to any fear of our great financial measures.

Then as to the various reductions of taxes. We have been criticised for having taken off the coal duty. Coal is one of the subjects which the noble Viscount would have continued to tax. I do not enter into the controversy as to whether the Party of the noble Viscount opposite had pledged themselves to take off the coal duty at the first opportunity, although there have been statements to that effect which have not been contradicted. But I think it cannot be doubted—and I am quite sure that my noble friend Lord Faber, who knows very well the trade of the north-east ports, will agree that the coal tax was a very serious hindrance to that trade. It is quite true it did not affect the Welsh high-class coal in the same way, because those coal-owners have somewhat of what is called a "seller's monopoly," and therefore I can quite believe that in that case, at any rate, a part of the tax was paid by the foreigner. But it was certainly not paid by the foreigner so far as the Yorkshire and Midland coal was concerned, and its repeal was recognised there as a great relief, not merely to the coal trade, but to the kindred trades. Then as regards tea and sugar, especially the latter. It is true we have given up £3,400,000 by the reduction of the sugar tax. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer believes that by the method he has employed in rather more than halving the tax he has succeeded in reaching the consumer as a rule. Those who buy infinitesimal quantities of sugar can hardly be reached by any means, but so far as the general consumer is concerned, my right hon. friend believes that he has reached him.

Then there is the question of the effect on trade. The noble Viscount said the confectionery and mineral water trades might have benefited. But those are two enormous trades; they employ a vast amount of labour, and surely it was worth while, if we could, to relieve them. I suppose that what the noble Viscount would have done is that, instead of taking off the sugar tax, he would have taken something off the income-tax, so far as it affects those who pay 1s., on the ground that that would have added to his possible war chest. I confess I was impressed by the argument of my noble friend Lord St. Davids when he said that when you come to the question of raising an indefinite number of millions, it is apparently as easy to reimpose your indirect taxation as it is to reimpose your direct taxation.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: I did not find it so at all in the South African war.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Not to produce the same amount. I agree that you cannot be sure of imposing the same amount, but assuming that the noble Viscount had only taken off the equivalent in income-tax, I confess I do not see that the one would be more difficult than the other. I am, of course, assuming that a large sum has to be raised. I am not, of course, on the point of the advantage of the one course or the other, but it does not seem to be reasonable to assume that in one case the money is always there at command, and that in the other it is absolutely and irretrievably gone.

it expected that this Commission's sittings will conclude and when will its Report be available; is he aware that some of the Irish railways, whether in consequence of this Commission being set up or otherwise, have seriously reduced passenger traffic facilities; and is it intended to propose legislation founded on the Report of this Commission.

MR. CHERRY: I am informed by the Secretary to the Commission that eighty-seven public sittings of the Commission have been held between October, 1906, and the present month. It is anticipated that the oral evidence yet to be taken will be completed early next year, after which the Commissioners will proceed with the consideration of their Report. I understand that the Commission have had some evidence relative to reduced passenger facilities on a few Irish railways, and have also heard the explanations of the companies concerned. Until the Commission have made their Report it is obviously impossible to say what action the Government may take on it.

Galway Extra Police Force.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the estimated saving in the cost of the police force in those counties from which police have been withdrawn in order to serve as extra police in the County of Galway.

MR. CHERRY: There has been no saving to the State arising from the despatch to Galway of the extra police appointed thereto under the Constabulary Act of 1836. No detachments belonging to other counties are now serving in Galway. As regards the past, it is impossible to ascertain what saving, if any, to the public purse was effected by the temporary absences of detachments of police from their proper counties, but the charge on the counties is often very much less than the expenses actually incurred by the State in transferring the men.

Treatment of Irish Surety Prisoners.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether men charged with cattle-driving and committed to gaol in default of entering into sureties to be of good behaviour are treated as unconvicted prisoners; and whether he will state in what respect their treatment in prison differs from that accorded to the women suffragists now incarcerated in England.

MR. CHERRY: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The treatment of prisoners committed to gaol in Ireland in default of entering into sureties to be of good behaviour differs in so many points from that of prisoners of the second division in England that it is not possible to institute a comparison within the limits of an oral reply.

MR. LONSDALE: Are these men compelled to eat prison food and to wear prison clothing?

MR. CHERRY: They may procure their own food and I think wear their own clothes.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that woman suffragists in England, guilty of similar offences——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Galway Extra Police.

MR. HAZELTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he will state the number of the extra police in County Galway and the amount charged for them against the county council; the number transferred from other counties and what counties they have been transferred from, as well as the number sent from the depot in Dublin; what is the legal quota allowed for the county and when it was filled up; whether any of the cost of the men required to fill it has been charged to the county council, and whether any expenses for extra police were incurred by the county council before the quota was filled up.

MR. CHERRY: I will, with the hon. Member's permission, circulate with to-night's Votes a statement giving the particulars which he requires.

Enniscorthy Vaccination Defaulters.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Local Government Board have ordered the prosecution of 238 vaccination defaulters in the Poor Law Union of Enniscorthy; and if, considering the increase of cancer in Ireland since the adoption of the present system of vaccination with calf lymph, he will instruct the Local Government Board not to press for the vaccination of those who object to the process.

Mr. CHERRY: The number of vaccination defaulters in the Enniscorthy Union is correctly stated in the Question, and the local Government Board have called the attention of the guardians to the matter, with a view to legal proceedings being instituted against such of the defaulters as have been previously notified and have failed to comply with the law. There is no power to grant exemptions in Ireland from compliance with the vaccination law. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary has already stated more than once in reply to the hon. Member that nothing, so far as the Local Government Board are aware, has been advanced to show that there is any connection whatever between calf lymph vaccination and cancer.

Mr. LUPTON: Is there not an intimate relationship between cancer and vaccination as shown in the Report of one of the medical officers of the Local Government Board?

Mr. CHERRY: I have no information.

Tullaroan Disturbance.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary fo the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the circumstances connected with the resistance offered to an inspector of the Estates Commissioners, at Tullaroan, county Kilkenny, on the 10th instant, when a mob prevented the reinstatement of evicted tenants on lands provided for them; whether he has any information as to the persons who organised this demonstration; and what action is to be taken by the Estates Commissioners in reference to the matter.

Mr. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that their inspector attended, not for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants, but in order to give possession to persons selected to occupy parcels of untenanted land acquired under the Irish Land Act, 1903, in accordance with a scheme settled by the Commissioners. The majority of the persons so selected were placed in possession, but, owing to opposition, possession of certain parcels was not given on the date referred to, but the Commissioners have now made arrangements for giving possession in these cases.

Captain CRAIG: Were the people who eventually got possession those who were named in the original scheme?

Mr. CHERRY: Yes, Sir.

Mayo County Council and Old-Age Pensions.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution recently passed by the Mayo County Council showing the difficulty experienced by applicants for pensions under the Old-Age Pensions Act, and the expense they are put to in order to prove their age, seeing that the Compulsory Registration Act was not put in force in Ireland until the year 1864, and that there are scarcely any means of proving the ages except through the Census Returns for 1841 and 1851, the original manuscripts of which are in the office of the Deputy-Keeper of Records in Dublin; and whether, to facilitate matters and save the poor people unnecessary expense, he will cause printed copies of such manuscripts to be supplied to the different county councils in Ireland.

Mr. CHERRY: My attention has been drawn to the resolution of the Mayo County Council. The Census Returns in question comprise about 3,000,000 separate documents, and the suggestion that they should be printed and issued for the purpose of the Old-Age Pension Act is wholly impracticable. Where it becomes necessary to search the Census Returns for proof of age no expense need be incurred by a claimant, arrangements having been made for the work to be done by Inland Revenue officers; and I am confident that every effort will be made by the officials to assist claimants in obtaining proof of their age. At all events, I can promise that no difficulties will be thrown in their way by the Irish Government.

Coachford (Cork) Tenant's Grievance.

Mr. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Land Commission has received an application for reinstatement from Mr. John M'Sweeney, an evicted tenant on the Fitzpatrick estate, at Rylane, Coachford, county Cork; and will he state whether it is the intention of this body to accept the offer of the evicted tenant, and immediately to reinstate him at an annuity which the holding can afford to bear.

Mr. CHERRY: I understand that Mr. John M'Sweeney referred to in the Question is not an evicted tenant, but was ejected for non-payment of the purchase annuity due in respect of an advance of £647. made to him in 1902. The Land Commission cannot reinstate him unless what is due for debt and expenses is paid.

Trawling Prevention Bill.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now state when the Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill will be pressed.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): I propose to make a statement to-day in regard to the business to be taken next week, and I cannot at present state when progress will be made with (other) Bills not included in that statement.

Professor Marshall's Memorandum.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will give an opportunity at an early date for the discussion of the Memorandum by Professor Marshall on the fiscal question, just published by the Treasury.

Mr. ASQUITH: The Answer is in the negative.

Mr. FELL: May I ask with what object this manifesto was published if it is not to be discussed?

Mr. ASQUITH: I think it was presented to Parliament in compliance with a pledge given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer a long time ago.

Hop Substitutes.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can state whether the North Eastern Agricultural Federation have forwarded a resolution to the effect that, in the interests of the public, the use of malt and hop substitutes in the making of beer should be prohibited; and, if so, what action, if any, it is proposed to take in regard to the matter.

Mr. ASQUITH: I understand that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer will shortly introduce a Bill to prohibit the use of hop substitutes in the manufacture of beer.

Maintenance of Main Roads.

Mr. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if representations have been made to him by the North Eastern Agricultural Federation to the effect that the Government should make the cost of the maintenance of all main and county roads a national charge, make a grant in aid of district roads, and take steps so to regulate motor traffic that the general public may use the roads with safety; and, if so, can he state what action, if any, the Government intend to take in regard to the several matters named.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have received numerous resolutions on this matter. The Government are fully alive as to its importance, but I am not, at the moment, in a position to state what action may eventually be decided upon.

Cost of Preparedness for War.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he has observed that, in presenting his Report on the Army Budget to the French Chamber of Deputies last week, Monsieur Gervais showed that Russia, Germany, France, Austria, Italy, the United States, and Japan, spend every year £207,000,000 on preparations for war; and can he give the equivalent figure for Great Britain.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have no information as to the data on which the Estimate referred to by my hon. friend was based. As he is, no doubt, aware the absence of a common standard of calculation tends to vitiate comparisons drawn between the warlike expenditure of one country and another, and any Estimate that purported to give the equivalent figure of the expenditure on armaments undertaken by this country would, for this reason, be misleading.

Liability of Innkeepers.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Prime Minister in view of the fact that it is an offence, indictable at common law, for an innkeeper to refuse to allow persons to enter or remain on his licensed premises after the closing hours for the purpose of obtaining non-alcoholic refreshment, whether he will take immediate steps to inform justices of the peace of the correct interpretation of the law.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): At the same time may I ask the Prime Minister in view of the fact that it constitutes an indictable offence for any innkeeper to refuse to accommodate any person and provide him with non-alcoholic refreshments after closing hours, whether he will take steps to indemnify those individuals who have in the past suffered penalties for allowing persons to be on licensed premises after closing hours owing to the misapprehension of the existing law by those responsible for its administration.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not aware that there is any misapprehension among magistrates or police as to the obligations of an innkeeper at all times to receive and supply food to travellers, or that any innkeeper has suffered any penalty for carrying out that obligation; and I see no reason for any steps on my part in the matter.

Mr. LANE-FOX: Will not the Government use their opportunities in another place to define the meaning of the word "meal"?

Mr. ASQUITH: I hope not.

Mr. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): Is it not a fact that innkeepers have been punished for having people on their premises during prohibited hours?

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not aware of that.

Irish Land Purchase.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Treasury have taken steps to ascertain the amount of the unexpended balance of the Land Purchase Aid Fund and the claims yet to be made upon it under the Irish Land Act, 1903; whether notice has yet been given of any proposed revision of the percentage as provided for under subsection (3) of Section 48 of that Act; and whether it is proposed by the new Land Bill to make the revision of the percentage retrospective.

Mr. ASQUITH: I understand from my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. No notice has yet been given of any proposal to revise the rate of the bonus as provided for under subsection (3) of Section 48 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. The provisions of the new Land Bill will be fully explained by the Chief Secretary on Monday.

Mr. LONSDALE: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to say whether purchase agreements made since 1st November will be liable to revision?

Mr. ASQUITH: I think the hon. Gentleman had better wait until he hears the Chief Secretary's statement.

Education Bill—Negotiations.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is able to make the promised statement with regard to the Education Bill and any Amendments which the Government proposed to make in it.

MR. ASQUITH: The Government, after much consideration, have come to the conclusion that the proposals which they are about to submit to the House on the subject of education should not take the form of Amendments to the Bill which has already been read a second time, but should be presented in order that the House may have an opportunity of reviewing them as a whole as a new Bill. These proposals are the outcome of prolonged communications in various quarters, and they will be put forward by the Government, not as the plan which we regard as ideally the best, but as one which all parties who are really anxious for a settlement of a vexed and long-standing controversy may, without any sacrifice of principle on one side or the other, concur in accepting. I have strong grounds for believing that those with whom, on behalf of our Nonconformist friends, we have been conferring, and, on the other hand, the Archbishop of Canterbury, are prepared, in order to obtain a settlement—and if there is solid reason to hope that a settlement may be so obtained—to support our proposals. Both have made it clear in their communications with us that they claim no authority to bind either the members of the Church of England or the Nonconformist bodies as a whole. Both have given us the assurance that, so far as their authority and influence go, they will *ex animo* acquiesce in the settlement embodied in the Bill and give their support to its being brought into effect. This is, of course, without prejudice to some not unimportant points of detail which may well deserve further consideration. The Bill will, if possible, if the rules of the House allow, be presented to-morrow, but in any case its provisions will be in the hands of Members to-morrow afternoon, or at latest on Saturday morning. I should hope, sufficient time having elapsed to consider our proposals, to take the Second Reading of the new Education Bill on Wednesday and Thursday of next week.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I think I ought at once to say that, as far as we are concerned, we think it is a very short time, if an entirely new Bill is not to reach us till Saturday, that it should be taken for consideration so early as Wednesday.

MR. ASQUITH: I hope the right hon. Gentleman and his friends will suspend their judgment on that point until they have seen the Bill. I can assure him that there is no intention on our part unduly to press it forward.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The right hon. Gentleman says that the Bill is the result of prolonged communications with representatives of the Church of England and the Nonconformists, and that the Bill will, in effect, embody something in the nature of an agreement. May I ask him whether communications of a similar character have taken place between the Government and the representatives of the 2,000,000 of Catholics in this country?

MR. ASQUITH: I am sorry to say that for some time there was an indisposition on the part of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church to enter into communications on the subject, but such communication have taken place recently.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask when these communications were entered into with the authorities of the Catholic Church in this country, inasmuch as I have in my possession, received to-day, a document from the highest authority representing Catholics in England, saying that no such communications have taken place up to to-day?

MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Gentleman is, I think, misinformed. There were prolonged communications on the subject in the summer. They were suspended for a time during the autumn, but my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education as late as yesterday was in communication with the Roman Catholic authorities.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.): Has the Prime Minister had any communication with regard to this proposed compromise with any representatives of lay opinion in the Church of England?

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): Should it prove impossible to present the Bill to the House to-morrow, what steps does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take to make us acquainted with its provisions?

MR. ASQUITH: If it is found that the rules of the House do not allow it to be taken to-morrow, it will be circulated on Saturday or to-morrow afternoon, together with an explanatory Memorandum.

LORD R. CECIL: Is the House to understand that there is or is not any agreement with the Roman Catholic communion?

MR. ASQUITH: I think the noble Lord had better give me notice of that Question.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): If the Bill appears as a Parliamentary Paper on Saturday and is to be read a second time on Wednesday, when does the right hon. Gentleman propose to introduce it and take the First Reading?

MR. ASQUITH: In that case it would simply be presented on Monday in the ordinary way.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS asked as to the general business for next week.

MR. ASQUITH said the Government proposed to take on Monday the statement of the Chief Secretary, and the introduction and First Reading of the Irish Land Bill. On Tuesday, in accordance with an arrangement entered into between both sides of the House, the Education (Scotland) Bill would be taken up to 8.15 on Report and Third Reading. He hoped his hon. friends who represented Scotland would be disposed to come into that agreement. From 8.15 the Prevention of Crime Bill would be considered on Report, and, he hoped, on Third Reading also. Wednesday and Thursday as already stated would be devoted to the Education Bill. He would be able on Monday or Tuesday to make a statement as to the business on Friday.

MR. KEIR HARDIE inquired whether any day had yet been fixed for taking the Report stage of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. ASQUITH: Perhaps the hon. Member will give me notice of that.

MR. ROWLANDS inquired when the Port of London Bill would be taken.

MR. ASQUITH: Well, we cannot take it next week, I am afraid.

LICENSING BILL.

As amended, further considered.

*MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said he rose for the purpose of moving the rejection of Clause 24, which was of vital importance to the Bill, because it dealt with the question of monopoly value. The monopoly value was very difficult to define. A definition as given in the Act of 1904 was fairly easy to ascertain, because that monopoly value was to be applied only to the cases of new licences granted after the passing of the Act. The monopoly value under the Act of 1904 was to be the difference between the value of the premises as licensed and the value of those same premises without a licence. The purpose of Parliament in passing that Act with that provision was that when new licences were granted the State was to have the advantage of retaining any special value which might attach to those licences, having regard to the fact that there was, and had been for years, a restricted grant of licences. He had always quarrelled with that definition. He believed the word "monopoly" was a misleading term. There was undoubtedly a licence value, but the term monopoly value was not a true definition, because with the word "monopoly" was associated the meaning that there was a true monopoly, *i.e.*, an absolutely restricted right in which others were not allowed to share. In the case of a new licence no real monopoly could exist, especially when these licences were not all held by one group of persons trading in the same interest. At any rate, the term had to be taken as it stood embodied in Acts of Parliament. It would have been better to have got a more accurate and more useful description than monopoly value. No one in the House or elsewhere disputed the fact that attaching to a licence there was a value, a something which did not attach to a trade for which a licence was not issued. When a licence was issued it gave a right to trade within limits to a number of persons who exercised that right to the exclusion of other persons not in possession of a licence. At one time there was no monopoly value attaching to a licence. The State from 1830 to 1872 issued licences for dealing in ales, beer, etc., freely to all those who applied for them. These licences were issued by the Excise without any application to the justices, and persons who got them had only to satisfy the Excise authorities that they would be able to fulfil the conditions in the licence. But it was undoubted that owing to the restrictive policy of the Legislature and to the administrative methods of the local authorities in granting new licences, the tendency of recent years for the justices and the Legislature to eliminate a certain number of the licences which already existed, a licence or monopoly value had been created. Under the Act of 1904 the value of the new licence was to be ascertained roughly by a system of tender; that was to say that a great many justices decided that if in the public interest a new licence was to be issued, they were to put that licence to private tender to ascertain what were the highest terms which a trader would be willing to give for that licence, and that was to be the monopoly value to attach to it. Any one who got a licence under these conditions did so with his eyes open. The conditions were fairly laid down under the Act, and one of those conditions was that the licence should not be issued for a longer period than seven years. Another condition was that the monopoly value might be revised year by year, or biennially, or triennially, or septennially, and if a greater value should accrue to licences issued after 1904 owing to improved conditions of trading the justices were to be perfectly entitled under the provisions of the Act and were even required, to put up that licence to tender again, in order to ascertain what the value of the licence should be. As he had said, any one who tendered for that licence did so with his eyes open. But when that principle was applied to any of the old licences issued by the justices and which had been subjected to sale and barter for many years, and which had been paid for in hard cash, the whole condition of things was radically changed. Under the provisions of the clause now being discussed, the Government intended within twenty-one years to take the monopoly value from the licence-holder. If he understood the explanation given by the Government of this clause as it originally stood in the Bill, they, intended to put these licences again to tender, and to charge for them accordingly. That principle amounted, in his view, and in that of those who agreed with him on the Opposition Benches, to confiscation.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.): I rise to a point of order. I ask whether it is in order on this clause to discuss the justice or injustice of the enacting of a monopoly value at all. Has that not been decided already?

*MR. GRETTON said he did not know what the position of the hon. and learned Gentleman was. He was not going to discuss the justice or injustice of monopoly value, but to show the hon. and learned Gentleman how the principle laid down in the clause they were now discussing would amount to confiscation and the difficulty of adopting any other alternative.

*MR. SPEAKER: It depends upon the meaning of what monopoly value is. If defined in one way it may be just, if in another way it may be unjust. I understand that the hon. Member is taking exception to the form in which it is defined in this section.

*MR. GRETTON said that that was exactly so. During the Committee stage the Government introduced Amendments which made it clear that the principle they now adopted was that they were going to charge monopoly value on the difference between the value of the premises as assessed for purposes of income-tax under Schedule A without a licence, and the value of the same premises assessed by the same method with the licence attached. The Government had also announced, though it was not embodied in the clause, that they did not intend to include in this valuation any charge for goodwill, but only the value of what they called the monopoly value—that was the value of the right to trade by an ordinary trader without having any special advantages or skill or any of the peculiar qualifications for the conduct of a business in the particular neighbourhood where the licence might be issued. As he understood the section, this method of valuation would be extremely unjust and extremely irregular in its character. There were very numerous cases, for instance, in the East of London and elsewhere in the United Kingdom, where the value of the premises with the licence attached was certainly not greater, and in some cases less, than the value of the same premises without the licence. The conditions of districts varied. Licences existed undoubtedly in many parts of the country where the value of the premises which had a licence attached was greater for other purposes than those of a licensed business. In some districts it was more profitable to erect a building to be let in flats at high rents. In such a neighbourhood there was a great demand for chambers and business premises. Buildings which afforded accommodation of that kind would command higher rents than similar buildings, part of which was licensed for the purposes of the liquor trade. In all such cases the monopoly value would be nothing whatever. In other cases in a poor neighbourhood there would be found what were practically cottage properties with a licence attached to them. With the licence these cottage properties were very valuable, but without the licence the property became really cottage property commanding a very small weekly rental for the purpose of housing working men and their families. In such cases the difference between licensed value of premises and the unlicensed value of premises was a very great one indeed, and when Schedule A was applied to the two cases the irregularity and injustice of the application was very apparent. In the case where there was no difference between the premises with a licence and those without a licence a very large trade might be done; in the poor neighbourhood a comparatively small trade might be done. It was perfectly patent that the application of Schedule A to the two cases was entirely inequitable, and was in no measure whatever the monopoly value of the trade done in these premises *qua* licensed premises. Then the method of assessment of valuation to Income-Tax also varied in many parts of the Kingdom. So far as he understood, the Government had abandoned any attempt to justify valuation under Schedule A as it now existed. They had said that they intended to raise assessments by a process which was to take place subsequent to the passing of the Bill and they intended that method of assessment to produce a much greater monopoly value than in many cases would be produced by the present method of valuation. The case was one of very great difficulty indeed in working out what would be the result of Schedule A under this Bill. He thought that the only possible method by which they could obtain it, was to apply Schedule A to those cases which now existed, where the assessment was on a higher basis than elsewhere. They could apply that definition most conveniently and to cases less open to criticism in London, because there there was not only the rental value taken of the premises but the valuation of the trade done in those premises. In order to arrive at the valuation under Schedule A the rental of the premises was taken, as buildings and the assessors ascertained from the books what was the trade done. It was a very unsatisfactory and inequitable way of ascertaining the trade done, but 10 per cent. was taken for the purpose of the valuation and was added to the value of the bricks and mortar and the land value of the premises. It was manifest that under that method there was some assessment of the goodwill and the great difficulty which the Government were in was that of eliminating the element of goodwill from their assessment of the

Mr. Gretton.

monopoly value attaching to the issue of licences for the purpose of the trade. In dealing with this question it was perfectly manifest that it would be a gross injustice to attach to a monopoly value any assessment of the goodwill. The goodwill was the result of the efficiency, personal exertion, business aptitude and other qualities which were brought into the business by the owner who exercised the privilege of the licence. The licence itself might or might not be a valuable property—a very valuable property if it was in good hands, and anyone who had experience of the trade would know that the licence in bad hands might become a worthless property, and lead to great loss to anyone who invested money in it. The licence itself was not, *qua* licence, the sole factor in estimating the success of the business, nor was the particular neighbourhood. The Government maintained that there were only two kinds of goodwill attaching to any licence, but in that he thought they were entirely wrong. They said the local goodwill, that was to say, the particular trade to be done by the ordinary man who came in without any special or extraordinary qualifications to do that business, and the personal goodwill, which made the success of the business, owing to the man's own personal exertions, were the two factors. He maintained that there was something beyond that; there was the trading goodwill. He would give an illustration of what he meant, and he was perfectly willing to give hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite the facts from which he was quoting. He was going to mention two particular brewers, who might be at a disadvantage if he proclaimed their names as being concerned in this matter. In one of the Northern towns there was a large brewery which occupied a block of buildings. It so happened that in that block there was one section, and only one, which was occupied by a public-house, the property of another and a rival brewery. On the other side of the same street there was another house which happened to be in the possession of the brewery he had first mentioned. These premises which intruded into their block belonged to the rival brewery. They desired to obtain this particular block of buildings for the purpose of enlargement of their premises, as they desired to have elbow room so that they might extend their premises at some future date. They went to the other brewer and suggested an exchange of the two houses. The brewer who owned this intruding block was perfectly willing to treat, and it so happened that the house was doing ten barrels a week while the house on the opposite side of the street was only doing two barrels. An arrangement was come to based on a difference of trade of eight barrels a week, but the first-named brewery obtained the licensed premises which were within their own building block, and the rival brewer obtained the premises on the other side of the street which were previously only doing two barrels a week. What was the result? Why, the trade of ten barrels a week went across the street and became the possession of the house which had formerly been doing two, and the two barrels a week trade also went across the street into the building block and became the property of the purchaser instead of a house doing ten barrels. Why was that? It was because of the goodwill. It was owing to the popularity which these premises enjoyed in the neighbourhood, in consequence of the attraction of the article which was sold in them. They could not estimate that. That was not personal goodwill, or local goodwill, but it was the business goodwill which attached to a certain trade the market price of which the Government had no right to confiscate by including it in its estimate of monopoly value. Instances of that kind came up over and over again, and he was quite certain that if the estimate was to be taken under Schedule A, as it was now taken in London for the purpose of estimating monopoly value, the Government were going to tax a man for his own efficiency, and for dealing in a first class article. Therefore, the man who had the greatest possible efficiency was at a great disadvantage, because he would have to pay more than the man who was less efficient and dealt in a less desirable article. The whole basis was that they were going to charge a man at the end of twenty-one years a price which would be a tax upon his own business efficiency.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): May I ask what the Schedule A values were of the houses, and to what extent they differed from one another.

*MR. GRETTON replied that his information was that the Schedule A valuations of these two houses were now absolutely identical.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Then the hon. Member's argument falls to the ground.

*MR. GRETTON replied that he did not think the right hon. Gentleman understood the argument. Under the proposal of the Government as explained in speeches they were going to take a valuation of the trade done in these houses——

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No.

*MR. GRETTON repeated that this was a question of valuation under Schedule A, and he was seeing how it would work out. Let them apply it to the new licences which had recently been issued in the County of Essex. There were not many new licences which had been issued under the Act of 1904, but there were a certain number and the application and effect of Schedule A under these particular circumstances was rather interesting. He was also perfectly ready in regard to the case he was going to give, to supply any hon. or right hon. Gentleman opposite with the facts, chapter and verse, in order that they might be verified, but he did not think that there was any advantage in disclosing publicly the private affairs of any particular traders in a way which would enable them to be identified. In the case of a new licence recently issued by the Essex licensing authority, there was a certain valuation made. It was made, first of all, of a vacant piece of ground subject to a ground rent of £50. It was then proposed that a provisional licence should be taken out, and an estimate of the trade which was likely to be done upon the premises which it was proposed to erect was made. Of course it was only an estimate with regard to the wants of the neighbourhood and the character of the accommodation, and of the building which it was proposed to erect according to the plans which were submitted and passed. It was estimated that the trade to be done was £5,000 and the gross profit was put at 40 per cent. which would amount to £2,000. The question was to arrive at the net profit. The ground rent, as he had said, was £50 and the cost of the building £8,000 which at 6 per cent. represented a rent of £480, so that the total rental to be paid before any monopoly value was charged would be £530. Then of course there were all manner of expenses, rates, taxes, licence duty, staff wages, compensation charges, the upkeep of staff, trade expenses, insurance, repairs and incidentals of all kinds. The result was an estimated net profit to the licence-holder of £300, and the arrangement made was that net profit should be halved between the licensing authority and the licence-holder. He believed in that case there was a seven years term. There was therefore a rent to be paid for the privilege of the licence, in addition to the licence duties, of £150 a year. That certainly had to be paid whatever the business done for seven years. The man who undertook that did so with his eyes open. No doubt he thought he was going to make a larger profit than his share of £150. Did the Government propose to apply that principle to the cases of the licences now existing? Were they going to confiscate half the value of these licences? Under the original clause they could not escape that result. Let them look at the application of Schedule A to that case. This particular building could not be estimated to be worth more than £100 a year if it were used for any other purpose, so that the difference in value between these particular premises licensed and this small value unlicensed would be £430, that was to say a capital value of £7,000. That was what the Government were going to take if this Bill passed. They were going to confiscate at the end of twenty-one years a capital value of £7,000, and charge the owner annually the value of the invested capital of which they had deprived him. A more unjust proposal than the application of Schedule A to the licences of this country for the purposes of assessing monopoly value could not be conceived. He noticed that in the Bill the freeholder's interest was taken into account in assessing the monopoly value because in the third schedule the leaseholder was entitled to deduct from the rent he paid to the freeholder a certain amount for compensation levy, and that represented a continuing interest in the monopoly value up to a period of sixty years. Taking as an illustration the case of licensed premises valued at over £900 a year and having twenty-two years to run, the compensation levy of which would be £100 in the third schedule of the Bill, the deductions from the rent in respect of that charge of £100 would be £13 for the first year and a sum of £382 for the whole fourteen years. Why should that be paid at all? At the end of twenty-two years the freeholder in the ordinary way would resume possession of the premises with the licence attached. Under the Act of 1904 it was reasonable to make that charge of £13, because the licence could not be reduced without compensation, but under this Bill at the end of twenty-one years the State would take the property for which the levy was charged. Why should the freeholder have the insurance deducted from his rental when at the end of twenty-one years he was to be deprived of his property? Then what did the Government mean by "resuming State control"? They said they were going to take away the local goodwill but not the personal goodwill of the licence-holder. By control the Government meant £ s. d. What they really wanted was that abounding revenue which the Under-Secretary announced that they were going to obtain under the provisions of this Bill. Did they mean that licences were to become State property under municipal control and that the profits were to be devoted to State and local funds? The Government owed it to the House to state clearly in what way that control would be exercised. If they did not mean £ s. d. and the full and abounding revenue, what did they mean? If they meant that, they were, without any explanation, going to confiscate under Clause 24 of Schedule A property which was estimated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Spen Valley at £95,000,000 upon which the people had been taxed and rated for years. He hoped that before the debate closed the hon. and learned Gentleman would enlighten the House and the country as to what the Government really meant by the full and complete State control which they were going to assume.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) seconded the Amendment. The questions which had just been put, in his opinion, illustrated the complexity and difficulty of understanding fully the principle involved in the application of Schedule A. The principle was one thing, the effect of working it appeared to him to be another. They had heard from temperance reformers a great many speculative and risky predictions as to the value of licensed premises, and it had been pointed out in debate that Schedule A had been taken because it had been found that licensed premises had been under-assessed and undervalued, and that the application of this schedule would lead to increased assessment. He had on more than one occasion asked for information as to how Schedule A would be likely to act, and had been told by the Government that they had not the information. In the course of discussion two public-houses in Hertfordshire had been referred to, and the Minister who replied did not deal with the particular instances as to which information was available, but certainly made some very grave admissions. The right hon. Gentleman said, first of all, that the Schedule A valuation was much higher than the ordinary Poor Law valuation, and secondly, that whereas the Government had not hitherto given an indication of exactly how much contribution levy they required or how they were going to use it, the Government now calculated that they could afford to give three years additional annuity out of the funds they expected to get. He thought it would have been of greater advantage if, instead of furnishing this information, which the Government must have had to make this calculation, in driblets, the Government had disclosed the whole of the information they possessed on the subject. The Prime Minister recently expressed the opinion that this method of arriving at the monopoly value by the application of Schedule A would not alter the local assessments in the country, and the hon. and learned Gentleman took the same view. But if they raised Schedule A they would correspondingly increase the local assessments and place an additional charge on the trade for licence duty for local rating purposes, and compensation levy. If they reduced the number of licensed houses by their redundancy scheme the result must be that they took out of the local assessment totals the extra value of the houses as licensed houses so reduced. The licensed houses became ordinary houses, and they reduced the local finances and the rates paid on local taxation account to the county councils by the amount of the licence duties taken away. One of these two results must happen. Either they increased enormously the charges on the trade or they drained the local authorities of their finances. In dealing with Schedule A he thought it advisable to take the definition as given by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. The Commissioners said in Paragraphs 104–5 of their first Report that:—

> "The valuation of property for income-tax purposes is (except in the Metropolis where the assessments follow those of the union assessment committees) in the hands of Local Commissioners appointed from the body of Land Tax Commissioners. They appoint assessors whose duties consist in procuring returns from occupiers as to the amount of rent actually paid and in framing a list of the properties liable to be assessed. A copy of the poor rate valuation is first obtained and from this the forms are issued to the occupiers. It is upon these returns that the assessments of Schedule A are made up. Should the occupier fail to make a return of his rent or of the annual value of the property occupied, the Local Commissioners make an estimated assessment generally based on the gross value shown in the last poor rate, though they are not in any way bound to accept this valuation, and may make an independent one, based on what they consider to be the true annual value. Notices of assessment are then issued, against which an appeal may be made. Such appeals are heard by the Local Commissioners, the surveyor of taxes attending on behalf of the Crown. If the appellant is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioners, he may claim to have a valuer appointed, whose valuation is binding. A new valuation is made every five years, and is adopted by law as the basis of the assessments for each of the four succeeding years. The annual value is defined to be the rent if the property is let at rack-rent on an agreement made within the seven years preceding, or, if the property is not so let, then on the rack-rent at which it is worth to be let by the year."

He referred to this explanation with the object of showing how it applied. Schedule A meant what, for convenience, he would call the rack-rent, which was the value of the premises, or the gross rents they would command in the open market. Some portion of Schedule D was more or less against the brewing trade. In the Metropolis, under the Valuation Act of 1869, the borough councils moved in the first instance, and the surveyor of taxes sat with them and assisted and advised them. They had the London County Council at the quinquennial valuation, over-watching and saying whether what had been done was all right. Did the Government absolutely ally themselves with the statements that had been made in that House as to the quinquennial valuation in London, and would they say whether it was correct or incorrect? He did not understand why the Solicitor-General shook his head.

SIR S. EVANS: I cannot say whether they are correct or incorrect.

*MR. BARNARD: Exactly; that was what he had been endeavouring to show, namely, that the Government's own speakers, while asking them to accept their compensation proposals were in doubt as to the basis they were taking.

SIR S. EVANS: No.

*MR. BARNARD said that was his view. What he wanted to show was that when quotations of certain figures were continually made, and when they multiplied the annual value of certain sums with some factor, to indicate how they would work out under the Kennedy judgment, he imagined from the way the figures were stated that the persons concerned thought that they were incorrect or unsatisfactory. At any rate, he would not go further than that. Perhaps more than anyone in the House he had recently had to review the whole question of valuation for local rating inside and outside the Metropolis, and he had to do so for this reason. Last year the Water Board brought a

Bill into Parliament. They collected their income inside and outside the county of London, amounting to £3,000,000. Inside London it was collected on the rateable value. Outside the Metropolitan area they collected on the annual value. Subsequently there was a joint battle before the Committee of the House of Lords and of the House of Commons on this particular point, and the conclusion to which he came, and he believed most people who had studied the matter, was that there was hardly any solid ground of objection to the quinquennial valuation which was in force in London. He came to outside London, and here let him say at once that he had listened with astonishment to the remarks of some representatives of temperance, upon these rating questions.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): What does the hon. Member believe to be the principle of the London quinquennial valuation?

*MR. BARNARD was afraid that he could not enter into a contest with the right hon. Gentleman on that point. He understood that the principle of it was to arrive at the hypothetical value of the hereditaments to the people who occupied them.

SIR S. EVANS: That will not do.

*MR. BARNARD said that, at any rate, that was an expression of his opinion. That was to say, the hypotethical value that the premises were honestly worth to the people who occupied them—the true annual value. He thought some hon. Gentlemen had a mistaken notion as to the method of valuation adopted in the country. In the provinces they had the right of access to Schedule A, and they availed themselves of it. They had their own valuation, and they sent their clerks from time to time to copy, in the case of each of the properties inside the assessable area, the valuation placed against it under Schedule A, and then by comparison with local information, they made their own valuation lists. It had been said that there was a huge difference between the valuation for Poor Law, and the valuation for purposes under Schedule A. Although there was a great difference years ago, it kept on getting less and less, and to-day there was a difference of a little more than 3 per cent. between the two valuations. The reason was that years ago very probably many of the properties were under-assessed, but latter-day legislation had so increased the charges on local authorities, and as far as he knew they were likely to do it still further, that it became imperative on the assessing authorities, in order to avoid a high rate, to keep increasing the assessment in order to keep themselves within a certain margin of pound-rate. That brought him to the question why, when those things were happening, and when there was no general system of assessment, the Government should single out this one trade and, practically speaking, raise its assessments. If they were universally raised, and if every other class of property were to be raised, he would have very little to say about it, but, as they stood to-day, they knew perfectly well, by a recent legal decision, that the licensed houses nearly all over the country had been raised to a high pitch of valuation, and he did not believe, except in isolated cases, that they could be put much higher. He desired to ask whether the Government deliberately intended by this method to raise the whole of the charges which were already too onerous in connection with licensed premises, or whether they still adhered to the view that the effect of taking Schedule A. would leave the position as they had already stated it, though in his opinion, quite wrongly. What was the machinery they proposed to adopt? They proposed, practically speaking, to take this particular entry as they found it, and then to deduct from the value as it was in the rate book what they said would be the ultimate valuation of the structural premises. The hon. Member for Rutland appeared to him to have shown that such an operation as that was almost certain to tend in the direction of unfairness to this particular trade. He did not personally believe that the Government were desirous of doing anything which was really unfair, but, when he carefully investigated the operation as it seemed to work out, he was forced to the conclusion that the monetary effect of it would be to give nothing at all approximate to the market value of what hitherto had been the buying and selling value of the premises. He very much desired that the Government should give the House a definition of what they meant by these words "monopoly value." He understood the Solicitor-General to say that the brewers' profits were to be eliminated. As he understood it, the brewers' profit, or, at any rate, the valuation of such things, were to be found, practically speaking, upon the rate books of most assessment committees in the country. If they put under Schedule A this higher valuation, and the assessment committees took it and put it on their valuation books, they knew what would follow. There was another question he wished to ask. They were told that in the future for monopoly value purposes they were to have the structural value of premises in one column and the monopoly valuation in another column. The monopoly valuation was to have nothing whatever to do with the wholesale profits. Therefore, it would be very interesting, and it was a fair thing to ask for, if the Solicitor-General would tell the House what was the extent and how they were to regulate and define what it really meant. Was it to be done on the same basis as the Inland Revenue dealt with licensed premises before, or what was to be the method to be adopted? He should not mind very much how it was done if he could in some form or other bring about the effect that compensation should represent what the property had been bought or sold for in the market. It seemed to him that on the present proposals of the Government they lacked the information they were entitled to expect, and before going further, the House ought to hear from the Solicitor-General exactly what he meant by these very doubtful words.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 15, line 36, to leave out Clause 24."—(*Mr. Gretton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'shall,' in page 15, line 37, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. MOND (Chester) confessed to some surprise at the action which had been taken by the mover and seconder of this Amendment in proposing the rejection of Clause 24. When the Bill first came before the House he noticed among members of the licensed trade, both in speeches and in private conversations, that the one thing that alarmed them more than anything else was the want of a definition of monopoly value. What they said was: "The Government are going to seize our houses; they are going to seize all our profits, and at the end of fourteen years we shall have nothing." He should have thought that the hon. Member for Rutland and the hon. Member for Kidderminster would have welcomed a definition of monopoly value which made it perfectly clear that, far from intending to seize their premises, far from intending to interfere with the brewers' profits or even with the profits of the publicans, the term monopoly value was defined and closely defined as the difference between the rental value of the premises with and without a licence. He could not understand how his hon. friend the Member for Kidderminster could ask the Solicitor-General to define monopoly value and at the same moment move to reject the very clause that did define it. If his Motion was carried there would be no definition of monopoly value in the Bill. They had passed the stage for considering whether they were or were not to charge monopoly value. The Member for Rutland seemed to have overlooked that. What they were now discussing was whether they should have a new definition of monopoly value or whether they were to rest content with the definition given in the Act of 1904. Suppose the clause was rejected, what would happen? Then, as he understood the Bill, monopoly value would still be defined by Section 4 of the Act of 1904. That section defined it as the difference between the value which the premises would bear in the opinion of the Justices when licensed and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed. That was the definition of monopoly value adopted in the Act of 1904, and if Clause 24 was struck out that was the definition of monopoly value that would remain. The principle was entirely the same. In the Act of 1904 compensation and monopoly value ran *pari passu*. As Mr.

Patterson pointed out in his excellent work, the two things must be taken together—

> "In calculating the monopoly value similar considerations will be taken into account as in assessing compensation under Section 2, that is to say, monopoly value will be the difference between the value which the premises will bear when licensed and the value of the same premises when not licensed."

Without the definition of Section 24 they had it, on the authority of what he thought was looked on as a standard work, monopoly value would bear the same interpretation as it did under the compensation clause, and these words which had been added, and he thought very wisely added, by the Solicitor-General were really more declaratory than absolutely necessary. But surely it was not really relevant now to discuss whether or not monopoly value ought to be charged. It seemed to him that it was entirely in favour of the trade to get the monopoly value down to the basis of the compensation value. They had been listening to the complaint that the compensation value was so low that it was not worth having, and he would have thought the trade would have been relieved to know that the 60,000 licences that would remain out of the 90,000 would have to pay a much lower monopoly value than at one time they evidently anticipated.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): The hon. Gentleman wholly forgets that in the case of compensation it is a limited annuity, while in the case of monopoly value you take the whole—two very different things.

Mr. MOND: I quite appreciated the point of the hon. Member—that when the compensation came to an end they would get no more compensation.

Mr. YOUNGER: My point is this. You only get a few years purchase of the difference in one case, while the difference in the other case is taken permanently.

Mr. MOND: What the hon. Member means is this; that as the compensation period lapses the number of years purchase you get is reduced, while in this case the number of years purchase is indefinite, so long as the business lasts. But the basis is the same. I do not say the amounts are the same. I confess I do not know in what way we can meet the hon. Gentlemen who have spoken. Would they prefer to have no definition of monopoly value?

Mr. YOUNGER: I will tell the hon. Member in a minute.

Mr. MOND hoped the hon. Member who always illuminated their debates would shed a little more light than they had yet had on this question. He had no doubt he would tell them why he objected to the Schedule A valuation, but he confessed it appeared to him an extremely reasonable valuation in endeavouring to arrive at the rack rent of the premises. In all the debates they had had they had heard a great deal about market value which had been a kind of blessed word like Mesopotamia, but he noticed that all the gentlemen who had had to deal with market value, including the Inland Revenue Commissioners and Mr. Justice Kennedy, had found it extremely difficult to arrive at, and they had made very different estimates. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue of 1904 issued a Memorandum in which they started by saying they wished to arrive at market value, and they made the following very interesting remarks—

> "In ascertaining the value of licensed premises as thus understood, the same general principles apply as in the case of unlicensed premises, but these general principles are subject to certain modifying considerations by reason of the monopoly character of the business conducted under cover of the license. This tends to enhance the rent that can be exacted for licensed premises."

They then quoted a case of which they had heard very little, although it was as important as the Kennedy judgment—

> "As Lord Blackburn laid it down in the case *Mersey Docks* v. *Liverpool*—'if the hereditaments are such as to afford peculiar facilities for carrying on any kind of business, that facility does, beyond all question, enhance the value of the occupation.' These words, though used at the time in a different connection, seem exactly to describe the case of a public-house, and accordingly the Commissioners have kept steadily in view the fact that the possession of a licence must, as a rule, substantially increase the rent the premises can command. They

have, therefore, in each case carefully questioned the valuation of premises for purposes of income-tax under Schedule A. with a view to satisfying themselves with reference to business done and other evidence before them whether that valuation corresponded, as it aims at doing, with the rent that on entering into occupation a free tenant might be expected to covenant to pay."

That was the language of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue who, after all, had had many years experience in valuation, and who had valued these houses for death duties. That was the basis they went on. They started with Schedule A, and all the Government had done with regard to compensation and monopoly value, so far as he could ascertain, was to follow the practice of the Treasury Departments. He would like to point out, although it might not be quite relevant, that he gathered from an answer he received the other day from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the interesting fact that in taxing for death duties and probate the Treasury were still proceeding on the lines of their own memorandum and not on the lines of the Kennedy judgment. So that the Treasury still adhered to their method of valuation for purposes of Imperial taxation. Be that as it might, it seemed to him that Schedule A aimed, and if it aimed it ought to succeed, and if it did not succeed it ought to be made to succeed, at arriving at the rent which a tenant would pay, and that after all was what they wanted to get at. They wanted to get at the difference between the annual value of the premises with and without a licence. The annual value to whom? To the tenant, and what better guide could they have? What better guide could they suggest—except the perfectly arbitrary kind of decision of the justices which they had under the Act of 1904, and which had produced the greatest fluctuations and confusion throughout the country where, in some cases, no monopoly value and in others a very high monopoly value had been charged,—what better guide could they have than the practice which the Treasury had adopted for so many years under Schedule A? It was quite possible that a large number of licensed premises were under-assessed under Schedule A. That in itself in local rating was very notorious. One of the reasons why this extraordinary method of keeping accounts had been adopted—charging the tenant a nominal rent and then making additional profits by charging fancy prices for beer—had been in order to make it difficult for assessment committees to find out the true value of the property. At any rate, when rating authorities wanted to find out the true value the rent book was always produced and nothing was said about the additional profits on the beer. But if Schedule A were used in reference to licensed premises in the same way as he had to pay on his house in London and as other people who owned houses not based on a fancy kind of rent had to pay, then it seemed to him the basis would be very fair in both ways. There was just one point to which he would like to refer, and that was the question put by the Member for Rutland at the end of his speech. He made an impassioned appeal to the Government at last to explain to the harrowed souls of the trade what they meant by resuming control. He had not found those words in the Bill although they had been used in speeches, he believed, but surely the confusion in the hon. Member's mind, so far as he could understand his speech, was a very obvious one. Resumption of control, as he had always understood it, meant the resumption by the justices of the freedom to refuse licences. Before the Act of 1904 the justices had an absolute discretion to refuse licences. That was the law which was not disputed. After the Act of 1904 and till the expiration of the time-limit the justices could only refuse licences on payment of compensation, except for misconduct. At the end of the time-limit the justices would resume control, that was to say, not the State in the sense of the Treasury; but the State, in the sense of the people through the justices and through local option, would once more have liberty to say how many licences they would grant or whether they would grant no licences at all. That was what was meant by resumption of control. Monopoly value was a fiscal question—quite a different question. It was merely a higher licence duty postponed for twenty-one years. If they were to charge a higher licence duty in the Budget of next year would the Member for Rutland say: "You are confiscating the property"? If they were to double his income-tax would he say that the State was confiscating his property ?

Mr. GRETTON: The hon. Member is quite as capable of answering that question as I am.

Mr. MOND said his answer was that he would certainly not complain of confiscation. He would say it was a grievous injustice and hardship, but he would not stand up and contend that his property was being confiscated. He had never been able to understand why monopoly value—the difference in the rental value between licensed and unlicensed premises, which was really in his opinion a rather clumsy form of licence duty—should be looked upon as different in principle from any other form of taxation imposed by the State. That was the real difference between the two things. Resumption of control was a question of administration; monopoly value was a fiscal question, and what they were going to take, what the State was going to take, if there was anything left at the end of twenty-one years—the hon. Member for the City cheered that. He knew that the consumption of beer had been steadily declining for some time and at the end of the twenty-one years it might have declined still further, and the monopoly value might not bring in as much as sanguine minds on either side imagined it would—either on the fiscal side or on the brewers' side. As he was saying, monopoly value at the end of the twenty-one years was quite independent of the question of resumption of control. If they excluded this clause hon. Members would only be in a worse position than they were in now. The exclusion of this clause would still leave the trade liable to pay monopoly value on the undefined basis of the Act of 1904. This clause certainly defined it, and that, in itself, was a valuable thing for the trade. Personally, in the interests of the trade, he would certainly vote for the clause.

*Mr. YOUNGER said that if this Bill applied to chemical works he did not think the hon. Member for Chester would have any difficulty in answering the questions which had been put, and he would take the same view of monopoly value as that which was being taken by the Opposition. It was all a matter of personal interest, and they must look at it from that point of view in dealing with licences in which they were interested, when they thought they were not being fairly dealt with. Surprise had been expressed because they had asked for a definition of monopoly value. The Prime Minister, from the outset, had stated that the monopoly value under this Bill was a totally different thing from the monopoly value attaching to a new licence. Therefore that should be swept out of the consideration if justice was to be done by the State in resuming what it gave itself, and not that which was the result of the labour, capital, and enterprise of other people.

Mr. MOND thought amending the clause would have been a better course to pursue than rejecting it.

*Mr. YOUNGER said the hon. Member for Chester had specifically made a point of the definition given in the Act of 1904, but nobody, not even the Prime Minister, the Solicitor-General, or the Under-Secretary, for one single moment would say that that definition applied to the monopoly value of an old licence at the end of twenty-one years. The kernel of this clause was to be found in the second part of the first section containing the new definition given of monopoly value, which would apply to old licences, as well as to all new licences off and on, now to be charged at less than under the Act of 1904 which was now repealed. That was one of the effects of this particular clause as it stood, although it was not fully realised by many people. On 3rd November, when the Prime Minister placed his definition of monopoly value on the Paper, he made a speech in favour of the insertion of those words. On that occasion, he listened to the right hon. Gentleman with great interest and attention, and he followed his remarks with the idea in his mind confirmed by what the Prime Minister said that the system of valuation in use in Scotland was one which, if carried out in principle, might form a reasonably successful method of estimating fairly this very difficult question of monopoly value.

Having that in mind he said in his own speech on that occasion that he did not consider that the Government had been altogether unsuccessful in their attempt, although he was particularly careful to say that he did not commit himself to that opinion, because the new definition had been sprung upon the House, and he had not had time carefully to consider it. He ended his speech by saying that he would give it his friendly consideration, and he had done so. He had carefully compared the system proposed with the Scottish system, and he had concluded that the definition in this clause could not fairly stand, because it would rope into the monopoly value something which the State was not entitled to take, and which under this definition the State was bound to receive. The day after he made that speech he found himself in a very unusual position. The Government supporters in the Press, anxious to grasp at any scrap of approbation, whether about Sunday closing or anything else from that side of the House, took up what he had said on this point, and paid him many compliments, and he almost imagined for the moment that he was a Parliamentary hero because he had said something which was not hostile to the proposals of the Government. He confessed that at the time he felt there was a fair chance of success for the proposal, but he was sorry he could not support the Government now, and there would have to be some alteration if monopoly value was to be fairly and honestly settled as between the licence-holder and the State. What was monopoly value? What did the Prime Minister say he wanted? The right hon. Gentleman had used the expression over and over again that he only wanted to get the local monopoly. His definition of that would be the value of an exclusive trading privilege granted in a particular area. He meant exclusive in a general sense. The first difficulty which struck him was that under this system they at once made the position difficult by introducing a hypothetical value. The value of premises made and constructed for a certain purpose must as unlicensed be of a purely hypothetical character, and therefore they had to estimate that hypothetical basis to start with, and then to take the difference between that and the Schedule A value, and between those two points they arrived at the monopoly value. The right hon. Gentleman also said in his speech that there were only two goodwills, the goodwill of the tenant and the goodwill of the State. The hon. Member for Rutland dealt fully with that point, and stated that there was something to be considered in addition to the popularity of the tenant and the monopolistic privilege, and that was the quality of the goods supplied in tied houses which gave a goodwill to the brewers. There was also the structural convenience and the comfort or attractiveness of the house provided by the expenditure of capital on the part of the owner, and it was impossible in valuing under Schedule A to ignore those particular conditions and leave them out of the valuation. If that was admitted, then the Prime Minister was taking something which he told them he did not want to take, in fact, he was taking more than the local monopoly value, because he was taking what was due to the investment of the capital and the energy of the man who built up the trade. The State had no right to take that. The hon. Member for Rutland in discussing the question of owners' goodwill dealt with the case of a public-house selling two barrels a week and one selling ten barrels, and when the brewers changed the ownership the trade changed over as well. That was evidence of the brewers' goodwill.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The assessment would be the same.

SIR S. EVANS: Does the hon. Member say we ought to make a difference between the two houses because in the one case the brewery sells better beer than the other?

*MR. YOUNGER said that in London there were two systems of valuing under Schedule A. One was to add to the rent a proportion of half the premium paid for the lease, plus 10 per cent. of the added sum of the two figures; the other system was to take 10 per cent. of the turnover, which was a particularly unfair method because of its unequal operation in differently placed houses. If they sold bad beer they were not likely to sell much, and if they sold good beer they would be likely to sell more. That was where the question of owners' goodwill came in. Outside the Metropolis the system was wholly different. The rack-rent was taken, the tenant paying the usual rates and taxes, the landlord repairing and maintaining the property. The application of these systems varied considerably. Sometimes the scale was high, sometimes it was low, and there was no consistent scheme all over the country. A great deal depended on the assessor himself. So far as he could see a good deal more than the local monopoly value was included, and all these valuations in the future would, under this Bill, be rendered more difficult owing to the operation of Clause 20 which empowered the justices to attach conditions to the renewal of a licence. The conditions so attached to a licence might make it difficult to ascertain the local monopoly value. Then the unlicensed valuation, which was the other basis, was, of course, purely hypothetical. There were perfectly well-known cases, as the hon. Member for Rutland had pointed out, where the unlicensed value of a house was greater than that under Schedule A, just as in a very poor district, the East End of London, a large and costly public-house would have practically no value at all if the licence were taken away. In the one case, according to the Government scheme, there would be no monopoly value at all, while in the other case there would be a wholly extravagant figure. That alone was enough to prove that the definition of monopoly value given by the Government was not correct and that the plan was grotesque. If their definition was capable of producing two so entirely different results, it was quite obvious that it could not be generally accurate, though, of course, it must be generally applied, for there could be no variation. Therefore it would be extremely inequitable in its application. In many cases it would be as absurd as it was unjust. He did not blame the Government or the draftsman of the Bill for inability to discover a form of words which would define in a consistent and logical way this will-o'-the-wisp called the local monopoly value. It had eluded so far all those who had attempted to find it, and he did not see much more sign of success in the definition given in Clause 24 than in the efforts which had previously been made. He was not an expert and it was not his business to give a definition. He was only there to criticise, or to approve if he could approve. It was the business of the Government to define the term, and he had proved, at all events to his own satisfaction, that they had not discovered a definition in this particular case which could fairly or properly apply. Another difficulty arose out of the extraordinary variations in local rating in England. Every parish had its own system. In some cases, as in his own county in Scotland, the gross 100 per cent. valuation was taken and that valuation appeared on the rate books, while in other cases the valuation was placed at 60 or 70 per cent. of the full amount. That was perfectly fair so far as local rating was concerned if all the ratepayers were assessed on exactly the same principle. But it was a different thing if they took this valuation as the starting point for fixing the monopoly value. If they took a low valuation, which was made for rating purposes in one parish, and a high valuation in the next parish, and then took the difference between these valuations and the Schedule A valuation they would get different results from what they wanted to get, and there again the monopoly value would be unfairly estimated. In his view some other system must be discovered if the monopoly value was to be fairly ascertained. It would be very difficult no doubt, but he did not think it would be altogether impossible. Regard would have to be had to various considerations, such as the requirements and population of the area, and an estimate of what the profits would be if the trade was carried on under free instead of restricted conditions. The other day he consulted a very able assessor who summed up his opinion of Schedule A very shortly by saying: "I am satisfied that Schedule A valuation would be quite inequitable." The Government had to address themselves to a solution of that. The monopoly value of licensed houses in a particular area depended upon whether

Report issued upon the systems of agricultural credit practised in Germany, Austria, France, and Italy, so as to ascertain whether and to what extent agricultural credit societies in those countries are under limited liability; or, if not, whether unlimited liability has entailed those detrimental consequences which the Government appear to attribute to it, and generally to obtain particulars as to the working of such societies.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board have published in their *Journal* from time to time articles dealing with agricultural credit banks in foreign countries. Information as to Germany was given in March, 1906, and as to France in June, 1905. The conditions which obtain in Austria and Italy will be described when opportunity offers.

Applications for Small Holdings in Yorkshire (North Riding).

MR. HAMAR GREENWOOD (York): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any, and, if so, how many, applications have been made for small holdings to the County Council of the North Riding of Yorkshire; what is the acreage, if any, already granted for small holdings; and whether the Board is aware that this county council has suggested to any possible applicants that they should apply to local landlords for small holdings and not rely on the county council.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) We are informed that 288 applications have been received for 5,494 acres, but no small holdings have as yet been actually provided. The Board are not aware that the council have suggested that applicants should be made to landlords, but we will at once make inquiry on the point.

Headford Kenmare Train Services.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received further represenations from Kenmare protesting against the alteration in the railway time-table, whereby the interests of the people of the district are subordinated to those of a few tourists; and whether, seeing that the Headford and Kenmare Railway is largely maintained by rates levied on ratepayers in the neighbouring baronies, he will see that the railway company is not permitted to ignore the reasonable wishes of the people of the district.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The representations to which the hon. Member refers were duly received by the Board of Trade and communicated to the railway company with a request that they might receive careful consideration. The company's reply is as follows—

Great Southern and Western
Railway Company (Ireland),
Kingsbridge, Dublin.
25*th July*, 1908.

Sir.—In reply to your letters of the 21st and 23rd instant, I beg to inform you that my Board have again gone into the question of the train service on the Kenmare Branch, and they find that they must adhere to the decision conveyed to you in my letter of the 8th instant. The question was very carefully gone into by this company before the change in time-table was carried out, and every effort was made to supply such a service as would meet the reasonable requirements of both the through and local traffic. I have only to add that the present service is really a better one than the traffic warrants, and that this branch line is worked at a considerable loss to the company.—(*Signed*) I am, etc.,

FRANCIS B. ORMSBY.
Secretary.

Establishment of a Model Farm at Castlequin.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland), whether he is now in a position to state what steps the Department proposes to take in order to carry out the establishment of a model farm at Castlequin, Cahirciveen, in accordance with the suggestions submitted for his consideration; and, if not, whether he is prepared to consider any alternative scheme for the promotion of scientific agricultural knowledge and the improvement of the breed of Kerry cattle by utilising the land now available at Castlequin.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department do not propose to question that he wished to examine this clause in the light of what was written and said at the time of the introduction of the Bill. What was then said gave a much fuller insight into the Government mind than anything proposed now. Before the introduction of the Bill, the right hon. Member for Spen Valley, their champion, writing in a pamphlet, said—

> "In 1904 I estimated the then market value of all the on-licences in England and Wales at about £125,000,000."

That estimate was exclusive of the premises. It was the licence market value only. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to give reasons for putting the figure at the present time at £95,000,000. He need not enter into the right hon. Gentleman's reasons for taking off £30,000,000 from the original figure. All the right hon. Gentleman excluded was bricks and mortar and the ground on which these stood. The right hon. Gentleman was entitled to pray the Bill in aid to the extent that the Bill gave no definition whatever of monopoly value, and consequently the right hon. Gentleman was entitled to put his own interpretation on the meaning of monopoly value. What did the Under-Secretary for the Home Office say on 28th April last on the Second Reading? The words had been quoted before. They were few but very pregnant. He said—

> "At the end of the time-limit we believe that the monopoly value will bring to the public purse an abounding revenue."

It would be for that House and another place to judge whether the present belated explanation of monopoly value was not merely a gloss in order to conceal the real intentions of the Government in this matter and the real intention of the temperance party which was behind them. And what did the Prime Minister himself say in regard to monopoly value, when he introduced the Bill? This seemed to him to be of extreme importance in order to ascertain the real meaning now. The Prime Minister said—

> "The second main object of the Bill—not less important though, perhaps, less easy of attainment—is the gradual but complete recovery, with due regard for existing interests, by the State of its dominion over its property in a monopoly which has been improvidently allowed to slide out of its control."

And then the right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "How, then, has that which we are accustomed to call the monopoly value in licences in private hands come into existence and been allowed to grow up? How have these enormous values . . . been allowed to come into existence? The answer is very simple. The State has received nothing, unless, indeed, the very small licence duty that is exacted from the owners of the licences of public-houses can be regarded as anything—and as everybody knows, it is a mere drop in the ocean. The State has received nothing, or nothing that can be described as in any sense a substantial or even a partial equivalent for the monopoly value with which it has parted."

In view of the above, he was entitled to say that, at any rate at that time when the Government, after profound consideration—because a Bill of this kind was not suddenly thrown on the Table of the House of Commons without having been carefully considered—there was every indication that the Ministerial Party intended to take an immense sum of money at the end of twenty-one years under the guise of monopoly value. What he was now trying to ascertain was what it was they really proposed to take under the new definition. Did they propose to take merely the value of the restrictive privilege to trade under the licence as granted, or did they propose to take very much more—the personal or the local or the manufacturing goodwill belonging to different people, or did they intend to take all? It was almost an impossibility to disintegrate these kinds of goodwill from the restrictive permission to trade. The latter was the bone, and round it had been built up the flesh and blood. It was as impossible to tear the one from the other, as Shylock found it when he was confronted with the attempted task of cutting off the pound of flesh without shedding a drop of blood. He would, for the purposes of argument, credit the Government with honesty in this matter. Suppose he had had the extraordinary ill-fortune to be one of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue who would have to form an estimate of monopoly value—because when they had passed this Bill they had not finished with the matter. Somebody would have to work out this definition of the monopoly value. Let him take the words of the clause—

> "The monopoly value shall be taken to be the sum by which, in the opinion of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, the value of the premises, as adopted or estimated for the purpose of income-tax under Schedule A when licensed, and without taking into consideration any provisions for securing to the public the monopoly value, exceeds the value of the premises for that purpose when not licensed."

What did the phrase: "without taking into consideration," etc., mean? If he were an officer of the Inland Revenue he should try to understand the matter in this way. His first quantity would be to find out the value of the premises with the licence. Supposing he brought that out at £400, then the clause told him that he must not take into account any provisions for securing to the public the monopoly value. For argument's sake he would assume that the monopoly value was £100, he supposed the clause meant that he must not take the monopoly value of £100 from the £400, and bring it down to £300, but he must leave the £400 standing. The words, however, were most obscure and might be read in a great many ways. On the one hand that would be the value, with the licence. On the other hand he had to ascertain the value without the licence, but that again would be a most difficult task. He did not know which was the more difficult to ascertain—the value of a licensed house with or without the licence—because, when he was trying to ascertain the value with a licence, there arose the whole question of monopoly value, and when he had to value it without a licence he had to enter into the arena of speculation, because he had to contemplate a state of things which did not exist, and imagine the property without a licence. Therefore he did not think hon. Members of the House should think that merely by putting a cut-and-dried form of words into this Bill, it meant that it was going to be a cut-and-dried or easy task for anybody to work out, however expert he might be. His next duty, if he were a Commissioner of Inland Revenue, would be to proceed upon the basis of the assessment for the purpose of income-tax under Schedule A. Here everybody knew that there were extraordinary differences, disparities, and inequalities. Different authorities took entirely different views. Sometimes the valuation would be very high; sometimes it might be very low; it depended upon the idiosyncracies of the assessors. There was no hard and fast rule. Therefore the Inland Revenue Commissioners would find themselves in every case with their major premise a varying one. The Government had felt that difficulty, because it was part of their argument that this unequal valuation with all its disparities was not going to inure, as they were going to have a fresh assessment under Schedule A for income-tax purposes. Let this House realise what extraordinary results were going to follow from that. There was always danger attending the taking of a first step in a new country without having worked out where that step was going to lead to; if they altered the assessment for income-tax purposes and made it higher, rating for municipal purposes would sympathetically follow—in fact, in London the two marched together at present—so that the result of altering the Schedule A assessment for income-tax purposes would be that it would everywhere be followed by a corresponding increase in rates; and not only so, the licence duty would rise, because that was based on Schedule A. It would result in gross unfairness all round for licensed properties. In their attempt to get a cut-and-dried definition of monopoly value by taking the assessment in Schedule A as their basis, they were going to do extraordinary injustices all round to licensed premises in other directions. And what an unfair position the Government were going to put licensed property in in another respect. They were really going to put it between "the Devil and the deep sea," because if Schedule A was increased, then under Clause 10 the owner of the licensed property that was taken away would to that extent get more compensation—he agreed that would inure to his benefit *qua* compensation, but that compensation was not paid by the State, but was paid by the trade to the trade. But when they came to the monopoly value, the screwing up of Schedule A would mean that the State would get much more monopoly value. They were calling on the trade to choose between one or the other. If the income-tax assessment under Schedule A was not screwed up, then the compensation would be very low; whereas on the other hand if it was screwed up, then the monopoly value became the higher because of that operation. The State got the advantage then in the shape of an increased monopoly value. He asked the hon. and learned Solicitor-General when he got up to reply, to answer this question: Is it only the value of the restricted privilege conferred by the licence which you propose to take under your new definition of monopoly value, or are you taking goodwill as well, and if so, is it the personal goodwill or the local goodwill or the goodwill of the manufacturer; is it all of each, or part of each, or what is it? The last point he would touch upon seemed to him to be of importance. If the goodwill was not included in the monopoly value how was the State to get that complete control of the liquor trade at the end of the time-limit on which temperance reformers had laid such stress? According to the new definition the monopoly value was only the lamb and not the wolf. Were the Government genuine in this matter? If their definition was honest it did not mean that they were to recover the control of the trade. This was a sort of sop thrown down at the last moment in the hope that it would satisfy somebody, and that another place would be led to say: "After all, this monopoly value does not mean much." It was intended not as a working factor, but as merely introduced to secure the passage of the Bill. Once the Bill was passed with this indefinite illusory clause in it, there would be a thousand and one ways in which the monopoly value would be screwed up and up until it reached such a figure as would amount to the whole value of the property, and the trade would be left with the bare bones and nothing else.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) thought they ought to have an answer to the speeches that had been made from the Opposition benches, but as no answer had yet been forthcoming he would like to put as shortly as he could the view which he took of this clause. He complained on the discussion of this clause in Committee of two things. One was that under it the monopoly value—the sum to be paid to the State—was to be fixed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, who were the Revenue officers of the State. They were thus made in fact judges in their own cause. He was, when he advanced that objection, referred to the Act of 1904, under which the Commissioners fixed the compensation, but in that case the compensation was to be paid not to the State but to the person dispossessed by reducing the licence. Therefore the analogy did not apply. He asked the Prime Minister at the time of the discussion whether, in view of the points which had been raised, he would in this Bill allow an appeal against the Commissioners' decision. The Prime Minister had said that he would consider it. The right hon. Gentleman had now had time to consider it and he would ask the Minister who replied to say whether that appeal would be allowed. A point had been made that the Opposition had asked for a definition, and having got one were not satisfied with it. They had asked for a definition certainly, but not for this definition. He had asked for one which would give effect to the definite and very clear pledges given by the Government on the Second Reading. The Under-Secretary had given as his definition of the monopoly value the annual value of the advantage conferred by the exclusion of free competition, and he had asked time after time to have in the Bill a definition which would give effect to that statement and that pledge. His complaint was that this definition was entirely at variance with the statement made by the Under-Secretary on the Second Reading, because it included the goodwill of the publican and the brewer, except the goodwill attaching to the personal influence of the publican and the increased value given by expenditure on the buildings to adapt them to this trade. Take the case of a man owning a public-house worth £200 a year and assessed at that sum. Assume that he spent £3,000 upon that house in order to adapt it for the purpose of a public-house and for no other purpose. The following year his assessment would be put up, say by £100. Under this Bill and this definition the effect would be that this £100 a year, which represented the expenditure of the owner of the house, would be exacted every year by the State as monopoly value. The hon. Member for the Appleby division had admitted the difficulty on a previous occasion and that he did not see the answer to it. Perhaps the Government would give them an answer in the course of that debate. He did not think the Government could deny that the monopoly value as now defined did include any goodwill attached to the premises. The Schedule A value of the premises as licensed necessarily included the goodwill attached to the premises as licensed premises, and the Schedule A value of the premises without the licence necessarily excluded that goodwill, and it was by deducting the latter figure from the former that the monopoly value was assessed. Accordingly, they had it definitely that, in spite of the pledge of the Under-Secretary, this definition of monopoly value did include the local goodwill. As an illustration he would take the case of a man who took a new public-house and spent his energy, money, and time upon it and made a good custom for that house. He had there created a real and increasing goodwill. Did the State create either that goodwill in this particular case or the value of the building in his first illustration? If the State created them there would be some ground for saying that the State could take the value, but if the State did not create either, what earthly justification was there for taking either of them into account for the purposes of monopoly value? His objection was not only to the use of the reference in Schedule A, but that the Government were attempting to apply the definition of monopoly value in the Act of 1904 or a somewhat similar definition in this clause to a new subject matter altogether, to which it could not be fairly applied. If the Government wanted to do justice they must put in a definition which would confine the monopoly to that which the right hon. Gentleman had termed "the advantage conferred by the exclusion of free competition." If they put in that definition the monopoly value would be simply what the charter of the State had given to the publican. To do more than that would be to annex, to appropriate the goodwill which a man had created by his own energy and his own capital. To take the yearly value of his capital expenditure was not to take back what the State had given but to take away the property of the individual: that could no more be defended than similar proposals put forward by persons holding the Socialistic creed. If this definition stood in the Bill it appeared to him that it ought to be fatal to the Bill, because he did not think any fair-minded man in either House who understood the real meaning of the clause could pass this Bill with this definition in it. For that reason unless some promise of some amendment was given by the Solicitor-General he would be compelled to vote against the clause.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) could not find any time when the State held this monopoly, therefore the word "resumption" was out of place. The first restrictions placed on the trade were in the interest of good morals and public order. It was solely due to those restrictions that the monopoly value was created. A different policy was attempted by the Alehouse Act of 1828, with very disastrous results. He took exception to the word "estimate" in the clause, and would ask the Solicitor-General whether it meant that the Commissioners going over the various houses might say that the Schedule they had before them was wrong; that they believed the valuation ought to be higher, and that they might base their calculation for monopoly value solely on an arbitrary estimate of their own, quite apart from other considerations. He would compare the effect of this clause with Clause 10. When they were dealing with compensation they were told that all would be well if the licensed holders would allow their assessments to be raised, in order that they might get a larger sum for compensation. He thought it had been pretty well shown in argument that it mattered very little what the exact amount of the compensation would be under Clause 10 to the trade, as a whole. It was paid by the trade to the trade, and they had not the same conditions that they would have under the old system. But after comparing these two clauses, if they got their assessments raised, as had been suggested, although they got a greater advantage by way of compensation under Clause 10, still the amount of the levy would be increased, and as the result of monopoly value being included they would be in an infinitely worse position than if their assessments had not been raised. Therefore, the State would get an enormous value in hand if they adopted the suggestion that these assessments should be raised for the purposes of compensation. Whether they wished the assessments to be raised or not, Clause 45, which they had no opportunity of discussing, intimated that it was the intention of the Government, partly by legislation, where London was concerned, and partly by administrative action, that these assessments should be raised, in order that revenue might be obtained. The third subsection said that conditions attached to the granting of new licences for the purpose of securing to the public the monopoly value might provide for the provision of the payment fixed for the purpose on the renewal of the licence either annually or periodically. He submitted that this would lead to worse abuses in the licensed trade, as had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Huddersfield, who said that if they wanted a licensed trade well conducted, they must give them security. That was exactly what this third subsection would destroy. They would be liable to this continual revision under the section, and the worst kind of tenant would go into the business, would make his profit as quickly as possible, by whatever means were at his disposal, and would then clear out, lest a further inquisition should come upon him. Hard as these provisions would be on the licence-holders in general, there would be a particular hardship in the effect of this clause combined with the Third Schedule on those owners of licensed property who had let their premises on lease. The Third Schedule provided for deductions that might be made by the actual licence-holder from the rent which he paid. Of course, if the assessments were raised, the result would be that more would be paid by way of levy, with the result that the licence-holder would be entitled to make a larger deduction from the gross amount of his rent. Take the case of licensed premises with a lease of twenty-one years, terminating coincidently with the reduction period, plus the seven years. Putting the value of the premises at £900, the levy would be £100. In the first year, there would be a deduction of £13 from the rent, in the second year £14, and so on, up to the whole amount of rent in the last year ofthe reduction period, which he believed worked out at £382. Was that not extraordinarily hard on the owner of the premises? All those deductions were a direct consequence of those higher assessments. It might be said that this was the case under the Act of 1904, but let the House note the difference. Under that Act, the owner in the end got the fruition, and got back his licensed premises into his own hands. He was able to re-let on further terms, and he had an additional advantage from the fact that a number of other licences were being suppressed in the meantime. Here, on the other hand, having made his calculation, he found that immense deductions had to be made from it, and at the end of the term, instead of resuming possession, he merely came into possession of the bare premises, and the State came down with a sledge-hammer and demanded monopoly value from him. That was a case of extraordinary hardship. On a former clause he had submitted a converse case of a householder. In this case the hardship was on the freeholder. What was to be the position at the end of the twenty-one years when monopoly value was to be exacted? This Bill was conceived in the interests of temperance reform, but it was also conceived in the interests of the Treasury, and when the time came, at the end of the twenty-one years, there would be a difference between these two interests. There would be the interest of temperance that less liquor should be sold, there would be the interest of the State that more and more liquor should be consumed. They would find themselves in face of exactly the same difficulty that the Government of India had been confronted with in regard to opium, that although they limited the abuse they could not take steps to correct it without denuding the Treasury. When it came to morality *versus* finance, it was generally finance that won.

SIR S. EVANS: This matter has been dealt with by every speaker in a way of which we have no right to complain at all. Nobody feels the difficulty more acutely than I do of getting an accurate definition, but I think it was the desire of everybody that monopoly value should not be left in this Bill undefined. In answer to the observations of the hon. Member for York, when he complained that the speech of the Prime Minister was made on the same day that the Amendment was put down, I have only to say that all along it was estimated by the Prime Minister that in his view and in the view of the Government, if we could, it would be advisable to put in a definition of monopoly value, and that Amendments would be put down with that object. At that time the Prime Minister made a full explanation of what his meaning was in regard to the definition—I am not going to ride away on a defence of other portions of the clause. We have got in this clause the concession made to the hon. Member for Sheffield with regard to the lump-sum houses; and we have got in the clause, also, the provision with regard to securing revision of amount, which I think is a very good portion of the clause. I conceive that hon. Members opposite are perfectly entitled to move the rejection of this clause in order to get a discussion on it as one question. It is necessary to remember in connection with the whole question that the definition will apply to two classes of houses. It applies at once to the new licences which may be granted after the passing of this measure. In other words, the definition of the monopoly value as described in the Act of 1904, which the justices were required to take on the granting of new licences, will now have to be changed in the basis of calculation for the monopoly value as defined under this measure. The operation of the definition, whatever definition may finally be adopted with regard to new on-licences, will be very small, because it will apply to a very small number of houses. With regard to other licences to which the definition will be applicable, it is postponed for a period of twenty-one years, and however difficult it may be for us to-day to define what monopoly value may be, it may happen that the wisdom of those who succeed will be greater than ours. It is only to those licences which come into existence as new licences at the end of twenty-one years that this definition will apply. Let us see what the words were in the Act of 1904, because we must remember that monopoly value was first invented under that Act. It is not merely a debating point that I make when I criticise those words, because if our definition is not accepted we must fall back upon what the justices have to do under the Act of 1904.

MR. CAVE: Why?

SIR S. EVANS: There is no other definition in the Bill, and the Amendment which is down on the Paper in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Kingston, seeks to restore the description of monopoly value given under Section 4 of the Act of 1904.

MR. CAVE said he had tried to give a definition and had considered and reconsidered it in regard to his own Amendment, but he had said very plainly that he did not think it would meet his point, and therefore he wanted a new definition altogether.

SIR S. EVANS: That shows the difficulty. It is quite right that I should point out that the hon. Member himself thought a better alternative would be the description in the Act of 1904. The hon. and learned Gentleman thinks these things out very carefully, and the conclusion to which he has come is shown in the Amendment he has put on the Paper. So far as I have been able to ascertain, I think I am right in saying that the hon. and learned Member has never put an Amendment on the Paper in the course of the whole Committee stage which was not from his point of view a perfectly serious Amendment. Under the Act of 1904 the justices had to fix and secure to the public the monopoly value in the way they thought best. If you take the words of that Act you have the proposal that the licensing justices themselves in some way, without the necessary machinery, without the qualifying experience, by some haphazard method, should fix what the monopoly value is to be. That is perfectly clear under the Act of 1904. Everybody knows that in practice, when that monopoly value was fixed in reference to new on-licences granted since 1904, the action of the justices has been by mere rule of thumb. I am not making that a matter of complaint, but it has been the result. There was a sort of estimate and what the justices said was: "We will give you a licence to which we attach the monopoly value. Will you take it?"

MR. YOUNGER: Has the hon. and learned Gentleman estimated the possible trade which will accrue, which is not altogether so difficult as he imagines?

SIR S. EVANS: It is much more difficult than to estimate the value of the premises as licensed and as unlicensed. But that is the condition in the Act of 1904 which for the first time created monopoly value—which made it possible for the first time to get monopoly value in respect of new licences. Of course it is perfectly fair to say in answer to that: "But you are now legislating, although for twenty-one years hence, in respect of existing houses." Let me come to the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs for a moment. He also has kept a very clear brain, notwithstanding that he says his brain is bewildered.

MR. YOUNGER: It is a perfect nightmare to me.

SIR S. EVANS: Then he has been able to conceal that remarkably well, for I never heard him deliver a speech in the course of this discussion which was not perfectly clear and plain and easily understood by everyone. I do not think that follows merely because he has a clear brain. I do not think there are many provisions of the Bill which have been anything but clear. I admit that portions have been difficult, but so far as any bewilderment is concerned it has been entirely absent from the brain of the hon. Member opposite and of a good many others besides. It is fair, when discussing whether or not this is as good a definition as you could have, to quote what the hon. Member himself said, giving him a full right to say upon reconsideration that he has come to a different conclusion. First thoughts are sometimes the best, and this is what the hon. Gentleman said when the matter was first discussed in the House—

> "He thought the Government had made a not unsuccessful effort to define in this clause what the monopoly value really was. He was bound to say it was extremely difficult to give a proper definition of monopoly value if they did not want to include tenants' goodwill and considerations of this kind rightly charged under Schedule B. What they wanted to get at was the monopoly value of the licence, in whosever hands the house might be—that was to say, to get rid of the goodwill."

MR. YOUNGER: May I remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that I asked him whether he was dealing with the Scottish point of view, and he said he was. So was I. But you are not dealing with it from the Scottish point of view, because I have found out since that the English system of valuation is totally different. What was present to my mind is not what is now present to my mind on further inquiry into the matter.

SIR S. EVANS: The hon. Member went on to say—

> "With regard to the Scottish method the assessor in Scotland made his calculations which enabled him to find out in a rough and ready way what the monopoly value of these premises might be."

Finally he said—

> "If the time were to be extended in such a way and under such conditions as to make it palatable, he thought there was a method sketched out in this Amendment which probably afforded as good a chance of defining what might reasonably be called monopoly value as any other system he could suggest."

I am not tying him in any way to these observations.

MR. YOUNGER: Under similar conditions I would say exactly the same now, but I find the conditions to be different, and I particularly dealt with the Scottish system, having asked the Prime Minister who stated to me beforehand that was the way he was dealing with the matter. I find it was not so.

SIR S. EVANS: I do not recollect that statement of the Prime Minister, However, the definition which is now on the Paper and which is now being discussed is the definition which was on the Paper and was being discussed at that time. I accept entirely what the hon. Member says. These were his first thoughts on the materials then before him, and with the understanding which he said he had when the Prime Minister discussed the matter. To-day he has called it a bad attempt, which he is perfectly entitled to do, but he has also called it a careless attempt, which I assure him it is not. Now let me come to the question put by the hon. and learned Member for Kingston. I am going to pass by if I may, in order to give time to others, the question put by the hon. Member for Kidderminster. I think he was confusing Schedule A with rating more than he ought to do. The hon. and learned Member for Kingston made three main points. The first was that the monopoly value was to be fixed by the Inland Revenue officers, that they were the officers of the State which was to receive money, and that therefore they were to be made judges in their own cause. Of course, to make a person judge in his own cause as we ordinarily understand that phrase is a bad thing, but I do not think we ought to apply that well-known maxim to a case of this kind, and the answer the hon. and learned Gentleman made to my reply, that the compensation was to be assessed finally under the Act of 1904 by the Inland Revenue Commissioners, was not a complete analogy, because he says the money in that case went to the locality.

MR. CAVE: Not to the locality, but to the owners of the houses.

SIR S. EVANS: The fund was a local fund. But let me deal with the question whether it is right for the Inland Revenue to deal with the matter. It does not make a penny of difference to the Inland Revenue. The same thing applies entirely to the question of income-tax. The very fixing of Schedule A is a fixing of Schedule A in order to attach income-tax to it, and that money goes to the State, and therefore the observation of the hon. and learned gentleman with regard to that matter is entirely unsound. I do not believe anyone will say there will be a tendency to do anything unfair or unjust on the part of the Inland Revenue officials, because indirectly by anything they may do in putting a valuation upon any premises for the purpose of Schedule A, they may be benefiting the State of which they are the servants.

MR. CAVE: Will there be an appeal?

SIR S. EVANS: No. There is no appeal. The second argument was that the definition transgressed the rules which were laid down in the statement of the Under-Secretary for the Home Office, and that the definition would make the Schedule A. value include the goodwill of the publican and the brewer apart from local goodwill. I understood at the time, and I am informed now, that what was intended by my right hon. friend on that occasion was this—that the Schedule A assessment should not include the personal goodwill either of the publican or of the brewer, and it is not now intended and it never has been intended to include personal goodwill either. A great deal has been said with regard to the state of things which arises because good beer is sold in one house and bad beer may be sold in another. I do not think Schedule A assessments are arrived at by having any regard to the quality of the beer at all. I know the hon. Member for Ayr Burghs gave some rough and ready method which was applied in London in order to arrive at Schedule A. I propose before I sit down to read the provisions with regard to Schedule A. which are applicable to London and to the country, in order to test whether or not our definition is a right and just one. In connection with the second head, the hon. and learned Gentleman gave a concrete case, and concrete cases are not only very easy to understand but are very often difficult to answer, because they are intended to be made difficult. You may put a definite concrete case which may appear to give rise to injustice. The hon. and learned Gentleman says, Supposing a house is worth £200 a year, and then there is expended £3,000 on the building and by reason of the expenditure the assessment is put up to £300, Schedule A would include that £100 in the monopoly value, and it would have to be exacted every year after the twenty-one years period. If there are any words which would make it easy to deal with a case of that kind by way of reference to the Inland Revenue officials or otherwise, I should not object. But I think the answer is this. The expenditure upon that house is made with reference to the licensing trade and, after the expenditure has been made I see no difference between that case and the original expenditure on the original building. The expenditure is in order to adapt the house for the licensing trade. The house, by reason of the licence being given to it by the State, is worth so much. It is worth more because it has been increased or better adapted for the purpose, but it is only worth that much because a licence attaches to it.

MR. CAVE: And because the money has been spent.

SIR S. EVANS: So is the money spent in building the house in the first instance. It is exactly the same.

MR. CAVE: You do not take monopoly value on the original building.

SIR S. EVANS: I beg pardon. You do if you ascertain the annual value of the premises in the one case with the licence and in the next place without the licence. I do not think in practice there will be any injustice at all done to anybody in the case which is put by the hon. and learned Gentleman. I think I might ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether there is any difference between the case he put and that of a house licensed since 1904 with the monopoly value fixed year by year. There is none at all, if the justices under the Act of 1904 did their duty, because there was no discretion given them as to the basis. They were told they must adjust the matter as best they could. The difficulty put by the hon. and learned Gentleman would be precisely the same, and the injustice caused, if any, would be identical. The third and last point was that the local goodwill would be included in the assessment for the purposes of Schedule A. The Prime Minister said it was, and it is included in Schedule A. The local goodwill is very difficult to define exactly in figures. In some measure a house becomes a better known house by reason of the activity and good management of the tenant, but the house would be assessed for the purpose of contributing to the State in the position where it is, and with the licence attached to it. Such goodwill, therefore, as attaches to it, which is properly described as local goodwill, we think ought to be included in all assessments under Schedule A. And that brings me to ask myself the question, What is there in the definition which makes it unfair if we apply the monopoly value after twenty-one years? Take a house with a business worked up by the personal attention of the tenant to a high figure. Schedule A for the purposes of income-tax says you must find out what the rent is, and, if not, estimate the rack rent. I hope the House will allow me to read the rule that applies to Schedule A in the income-tax, and I will also read the provision in regard to the Metropolis. The general rule for estimating under Schedule A is—

> "The annual value of lands, tenements, hereditaments, or heritages charged under Schedule A shall be understood to be the rent by the year at which the same are let at rack rent if the amount of such rent shall have been fixed by agreement commencing with the period of seven years preceding the fifth day of April next before the time of making the assessment, but if the same are not so let at rack rent, then at the rack rent at which the same are worth to be let by the year."

That was the general Schedule A. The provision in the Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869, provided that Schedule A value—

> "Means the annual rent which a tenant might reasonably be expected, taking one year with another, to pay for an hereditament, if the tenant undertook to pay all usual tenant's rates and taxes, and tithe commutation rent charge, if any, and if the landlord undertook to bear the cost of the repairs and insurance, and the other expenses, if any, necessary to maintain the hereditament in a state to command that rent."

Bearing in mind what the basis of valuation for assessment under Schedule A is, I ask is it fair or not to say that you ought to fix a monopoly value with reference to the difference in the rack-rent, not which the particular tenant pays to the particular brewer, but which, looking to the thing as a whole, if there be no rack-rent in existence, where it is premises with a licence attached, and estimating it also as premises without a licence—is it fair or not to say that the difference between those two things is the increased value given to those premises by reason of the licence which has been conceded to the premises or to the owner of the premises by the State? That is the foundation of this definition. It may not be perfect. It has been said on all sides that a definition is advisable, but I think I am right in saying that although it may be attacked here and there more or less successfully and only defended less or more successfully, that definition holds the field. It was a complaint when we were discussing compensation that that was unfair to the brewers; now it is a complaint the other way. And until I hear a better definition I am satisfied that the definition we have put in the Bill is as near the right definition as can be got.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University): My hon. and learned friend has claimed that his definition holds the field, but I am very glad to think that even if it holds the field it will not come into force at any rate for twenty-one years. That is a matter for congratulation considering the fact that we are now seriously discussing at the twelfth hour what is really the paramount question in relation to the whole of the proposals of the Bill, namely, the question of monopoly value. I think it is remarkable that in the short time allotted to us we are supposed to discuss some twenty clauses and five schedules. I think we have now arrived at a condition of affairs in relation to this question in which I may safely say that there are not twenty Members in the House who know what will happen at the end of the twenty-one years period. This section is doubly important for the reason that you are taking away by it the possibility of a discussion as to what monopoly value means when the matter comes to be adjudicated upon. Under the Act of 1904 you had a discussion before the magistrates where you could be represented and examine witnesses. The last discussion on this question is the one that takes place to-night, and there will not be any more room for the discussion of this subject before any tribunal and the whole thing is to be left in this condition. The Solicitor-General has made two admissions which must startle those who are trying to get at what it is that the State proposes to take possession of at the end of twenty-one years. We were told by the Under-Secretary for the Home Office, as quoted by the hon. and learned Member for Kingston, that all the State wanted was the advantages conferred by the exclusion of free competition. Is that what the Solicitor-General has just told us? He told us if you had a licensed house—and when you have got the licensed house you have the monopoly—you have the advantage of the exclusion of free competition. If after you have got the licence you spend £3,000 upon the premises, that raises the assessment £100 a year, and the hon. and learned Gentleman says that the State has a right to confiscate that.

SIR S. EVANS: No.

SIR E. CARSON: The Solicitor-General says that the State has a right to resume possession of that, and I want to know where the State gets that right. We are asked what is the difference between a house in which there is no licence and one where a licence has been granted in regard to the making of improvements. I wish to point out that in my illustration when the improvements were made the man had the monopoly and that is the monopoly conferred; but under this clause if you spend £3,000 and thereby raise the value of the premises for the purposes of valuation under Schedule A the State comes in and claims to take that money away.

SIR S. EVANS: No.

SIR E. CARSON: Yes, it does, according to the hon. and learned Gentleman's argument, and it necessarily is so. The answer given to us was that there was no difference between that and an old house, because if what is to be taken by the State is the exclusion of free competition that was there before the man spent his £3,000, and according to the

Solicitor-General the State will resume possession of it.

SIR S. EVANS: I did not say anything at all about resuming possession of that £3,000, but the State has a right to say that the house has been increased in value so much by the monopoly we have given, and that is the monopoly value which we take.

SIR E. CARSON: Surely the Solicitor-General does not mean that. My point is that you have given the monopoly before the improvement is made, and yet you say that the State is to resume possession of it. I think the point is too clear for argument. In the first place, you give a monopoly and a man afterwards spends £3,000. Then the State takes advantage of that; therefore, I say you are taking something which has arisen after you have given the monopoly. The Solicitor-General tells us that the local goodwill is to be resumed possession of by the State and charged for at the end of the period in assessing what the owner of the licence will have to pay for the local monopoly. Does the State create the goodwill?

SIR. S. EVANS: Yes.

SIR E. CARSON: I cannot see how the State creates the goodwill. It creates the licence, but to say that is creating the local goodwill is an abuse of terms. At the eleventh hour, in considering this matter, we are told that the State is going to charge, at the end of twenty-one years, for money which has been expended upon improvements in bricks and mortar, and also the local goodwill created by that expenditure. That is not what the majority of hon. Members thought was going to be done under the Bill. That is not what the great majority of this House understood was going to be resumed possession of by the State, and I do not think it entered into the heads of any of them that such things were going to be included. Anything more unfair it is impossible to conceive than to say that the money spent upon bricks and mortar, and the local goodwill created by the energy put into the business, should be taken over by the State. The only thing we can congratulate ourselves upon is that if this Bill does become law there will be twenty-one years in which the owners of this property will be able to agitate for a fairer plan. The Solicitor-General said very truly that it is extremely difficult to define this matter, but is that any reason why we should legislate according to this definition? It is no reason at all. If we have not come to a conclusion as to what it means, or how it ought to be defined, then I think we ought to leave it alone. When we are dealing with between 60,000 and 90,000 licences, surely it is no excuse to say in the House of Commons that we must make the best of a bad job, because we can do no better. Is that the kind of legislation which ought to be passed by this House? Is it the kind of clause which we ought to pass with the guillotine and let go from this House without half a dozen hon. Members really understanding what is being done? I do not think there are half a dozen hon. Members who can tell us what will be included in or excluded from the monopoly value, and it is rather remarkable that during the whole of this afternoon when the discussion was going on there were not more than twenty or thirty hon. Members present, and the vast bulk of them know nothing about what we are doing by this proposal. Let us consider for a few moments what is being included in Schedule A. I have had some experience in taxation cases and in licensing cases, and I must confess that I do not know what is included in Schedule A, and for this reason. There is no scientific and uniform method of making any valuation under Schedule A. I know perfectly well what has happened to myself when I took a house in the country. The man who was there before me happened to be a poor man, and the moment I went there the assessing authority put a large valuation on the house because they thought I had a large income. That was all very well, but it was very unsatisfactory to me. I did not grumble, for I would do anything rather than go to law. How could anyone tell on what basis we are going to charge the monopoly value at the end of twenty-one years? Let me ask a question. In a village which I have in my mind, there is a small population, and there are five licensed houses. In putting down the valuation under Schedule A in regard to each of these houses, is it taken into consideration that there are five? The Solicitor-General cannot tell me.

SIR S. EVANS: Schedule A is part of the law of the land, and has been for forty years.

SIR E. CARSON: I say it is impossible to assess the monopoly value under Schedule A. The hon. and learned Gentleman does not know what he is really doing in this Bill. What we want to get at is what advantage is gained by the exclusion of free competition? If you have only one public-house in the village instead of five, is there, under those circumstances, any difference in the valuation under Schedule A? That goes to the root of the whole question, because, I think, if there is no difference, you pay the same price for the monopoly value whether you are competing with five or fifty houses. Where do you get the advantage conferred by the exclusion of free competition? It is nowhere in the Bill, and it is nowhere in the Schedule, and, therefore, the moment you get down to the root of this it shows the ignorance under which we are legislating here. We do not know the very principles on which Schedule A is framed in relation to the free competition of other houses. That one point demonstrates that, although your definition may hold the field, and you may be exceedingly proud of it, it is a definition on a false basis, giving a false reason for assessing the monopoly value. You are leaving nothing whatsoever open, as I understand, to be considered by the Commissioners who are to sit at Somerset House, or somewhere in London. The whole matter goes through cut and dried, under a section of an Act of Parliament. They are not entitled, as I understand, to take any single condition affecting the premises or the locality of a public-house into consideration. That is the tribunal you are setting up and from which the hon. and learned Gentleman is going to give no appeal. In the most ordinary case of the assessment of a public-house for death duties you can appeal against the decision of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue and take the appeal right up to the highest Court in the land, and rightly so, because no tribunal ought to be judge in its own cause. What is the reason why you are going to assess the monopoly value in regard to 60,000 or 70,000 public-houses at the end of the reduction period when resuming that value for the State, and at the same time make your own officers the judges in the cause? This definition, although it holds the field, is a faulty one and founded upon no proper basis and no proper assessment. The hon. and learned Gentleman was asked one question which he has not answered. He was asked the meaning of the words "without taking into consideration any provisions for securing to the public the monopoly value."

SIR S. EVANS: They were explained by the Prime Minister.

SIR E. CARSON: They were not explained by the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman said they would be explained hereafter. I am bound to say that I do not understand them. Do they mean that you are to add something or to subtract something from Schedule A?

SIR S. EVANS: It is quite true that I did not answer that question in the course of the long speech I made. I answered several questions, but I did not take a note of that particular one. I am prepared to answer it, but not by replying to the question across the Table—Is it an addition or a subtraction?

SIR E. CARSON: What is the meaning of the words?

SIR S. EVANS: The meaning of the words I can put easily in figures. Supposing that a house is worth £100 without a licence and £120 with a licence, at the present moment £120 goes to the landlord. When we resume possession of the monopoly value, say the £20, it will go to the State. The value of the licensed premises will still be £120. Therefore, though the landlord will only have to pay property tax on £100, the value of the house is to be taken as £120 when you make a comparison in order to ascertain the difference between the licensed and the unlicensed value of the house. [MINISTERIAL cheers.]

SIR E. CARSON: I take it that that cheer means that the House thoroughly understands the explanation given by the hon. and learned Gentleman. I think, to put it shortly, that you add £20. It is not a very satisfactory way of dealing with a matter of great importance. It is a matter with respect to which we were told by the Prime Minister that we should have full information. The matter was put before him, and we only get this answer now. I am sure that it is a perfectly good explanation if we could only understand it. I have tried to understand the matter under somewhat difficult conditions, and I, at all events, may express my great gratification that the House of Lords will set these matters right if further Amendments should be considered necessary. Another matter has not been explained in relation to subsection (3):—

> "The conditions attached to the grant of a new licence for the purpose of securing to the public the monopoly value may provide for the revision of the payment fixed for the purpose on the renewal of the licence either annually or periodically, or for fixing in some future year the amount of the payment to be made in the event of the licence being renewed in that year."

By whom is this to be done? Is it to be done by the Inland Revenue, or by whom? Does it mean there is to be a revision outside and in addition to Schedule A, or does it mean there must be a new Schedule A? I really do not understand what it means, unless it is for the purpose of increasing the charge for the monopoly value and taking more from the trade. None of these matters have been explained, and the fact is, the clause, like many others, leaves the House in a hapless, hopeless condition.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 289; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 402.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ. Williams(Dev'np'rt)
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, SirJ.H.(Essex, Romford
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, RtHnSirJ T(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.

Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W.J.(S.Pancras,W.)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, SirW.Howell (Bristol,S)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Wals'll)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.

Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn.HerbertJohn
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, NE.)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget

Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard)
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN(Doncast'r)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,SirCharlesEdw.(Stafford)
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.HnE(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,JDundas(Dumbart'nsh.)
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnard, E. B.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm)

Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert Lanark, (Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Oddy, John James
Paulton, James Mellor
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Tillett, Louis John
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Seven of the clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 16, lines 20 and 21, to leave out the words 'holder of the licence proves,' and to insert the words 'it is proved.'"

"In page 16, line 28, at end, to insert the words 'and to all the circumstances under which the amount was fixed.'"

"In page 16, line 29, after the word 'sum,' to insert the word 'so.'"

"In page 16, line 30, to leave out the words 'holder of the licence,' and to insert the words 'person appearing to the Commissioners (after requiring, if they think fit, a Report from the licensing justices on the matter) to be entitled thereto.'"

"In page 16, line 33, at end, to insert the words 'in accordance with rules made for the purpose by the Treasury.'"

"In page 17, line 9, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"

"In page 17, line 27, to leave out the words 'consultation with,' and to insert the word 'giving.'"

"In page 17, line 27, at end, to insert the words 'an opportunity for consulting with them.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) moved to leave out Clause 36. They had always said on that side of the House during the course of those debates that legislation having for its object the promotion of temperance would not be effective in the form proposed by this Bill. In moving the omission of this clause the ground on which he took his stand was that he did not believe that the Bill was a good Bill, and that he did not want to accentuate its evils by including clubs in the same legislation as public-houses. It was perfectly clear that the position which he took up was logical, and that the omission of this clause in no way interfered with the statement that legislation without dealing with clubs was a farce, and that the question of clubs ought to be left for another measure, because the whole manner of legislation in this Bill was wrong. The clause provided that a club required to be registered and that that registration should require annual renewal. His recollection of the Act of 1902 was that no club could be started unless it was registered, and that if any complaints were made against a club, it was in the power of any person having information against the club, to bring that complaint before the justices by whom the registration might be cancelled. That was how the law stood after 1902. He did not see in what way that law was improved by this particular clause. He supposed that the secretary to the club was to make an application annually for a renewal of the registration of the club, and that that application was more or less formal; but he would make it now, if the Bill passed, to a court of summary jurisdiction instead of to the licensing justices. He did not object to that; but he must allude for a moment to Clause 37, which said that if any person made objection to the renewal of the registration of the club within fourteen days of the application for registration, it would be in the power of the magistrate to cancel the renewal of the registration of the club on the ground that certain wrong things had been sanctioned in that particular club. He failed to see what the advantage of the provision was. Suppose a club appointed a secretary, he with considerable trouble would have to attend before the Court, and make an application, with all the formalities which were imposed upon all people who had to attend before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction or indeed any Court at all. With regard to the secretary of the Carlton or any large club of that sort, no doubt no great inconvenience would be entailed, because all that would happen would be that he would have to go and fill up a form and make the application. He might have to wait three or four hours as people did when they had to attend police courts, and the case might be adjourned for a week. In the case of the Carlton it took up some of the secretary's time and no great harm was done to anybody, but in the case of a working men's club, the secretary was a working man himself, and his time was valuable, and if it was taken up in dancing attendance on a police court, in order to register the club, then, he thought, considerable hardship would be placed upon working men's clubs. In fact, it again illustrated what they had said, over and over again in the course of the debate: that all this legislation was directed against the poor man, and was in favour of the rich. It was an extraordinary coincidence that with the return of a democratic Parliament to power, full of representatives of the working classes, they had so little faith in the class which they represented that they must legislate for them, and tell them what they ought to do and how they ought to behave. All this legislation penalised the poor man, while it allowed the rich man to go free. They must also remember that Clause 36, which was gathered up with Clause 37, gave an opportunity to any malicious person who had any grievance against the club or any person in it, to make a complaint. It might be perfectly ill-founded, and might not result in registration of the club being refused, but it might entail upon the club the disadvantage of going to the expense and trouble of putting their case before the magistrates and demonstrating that a renewal ought to be granted. As they had to discuss something like eleven clauses and the schedules in two and a half hours, and there were no doubt many points that hon. Gentlemen desired to make, he would content himself with moving the rejection of the clause.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn) seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 3, to leave out Clause 36.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'local' in page 20, line 7, stand part of the Bill."

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) did not think there was very much in the Amendment, as this clause was very thoroughly discussed in Committee. He admitted that as the clause originally appeared in the Bill it was open to some objection, but the Government very wisely had altered the authority; they had taken the matter away from the licensing justices, and placed it in the hands of a regular Court, the stipendiary magistrates, and the clubs did not object and had no feeling at all upon the matter. He thought it was waste of time to try and lash up any kind of feeling against this section, so long as the people affected had not that feeling themselves. He suggested, therefore, that they should go on to some other Amendment.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham) did not know whether the Government would find it more convenient to reply upon the general effect of the clause then, or upon a later Amendment. He thought his hon. friends on that side of the House were not anxious to press the matter on this particular Amendment. They were quite ready to discuss it upon the later one of the Solicitor-General, if convenient.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Government are anxious to proceed with the business on the Paper, and if the hon. Baronet will withdraw his Amendment we shall be pleased. There is really nothing fresh to say on this clause, which was discussed in Committee, and the Government have nothing to add.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes 53. (Division List No. 403.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Atherly-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dann, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W. E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones,Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan

Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Sir Charles Edw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon.T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Barnard, E. B.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gretton, John
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nolan, Joseph
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Pee
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Stanier, Beville
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col.W. H. (Lancashire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Earl Winterton.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, lines 7 and 8, to leave out the words 'local stipendiary magistrate or local.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) thought it was due to the House that the Solicitor-General should explain what was the intention of the Government and what exactly the jurisdiction would be in regard to clubs.

SIR S. EVANS said the matter of the tribunal before which club offences were to be brought and the registration of clubs would take place was fully discussed in Committee, and the general feeling was gathered by the Prime Minister when he made the concession that there should be a regular judicial tribunal instead of the licensing justices. All these drafting Amendments were the result of the concession then made. With regard to the word "Court" the definition as now appearing in the Bill would come in on Clause 37. It meant that a stipendiary would deal with the matter in those districts where there was one, and in other districts where there was no stipendiary the Court would be one of summary jurisdiction.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 20, line 8, to leave out the words 'of summary jurisdiction,' and to insert the words 'as hereinafter defined.'"

"In page 20, line 10, to leave out the words 'local stipendiary magistrate or local.'"

"In page 20, line 11, to leave out the words 'of summary jurisdiction.'"

"In page 20, line 16, to leave out the word 'unless,' and to insert the words 'Provided that.'"

"In page 20, line 16, to leave out the word 'is,' and to insert the word 'if.'"

"In page 20, line 16, at end, to insert the words 'failure to make the.'"

"In page 20, line 17, to leave out the words 'not made owing,' and to insert the word 'due.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 17, at end, to insert the words 'may extend the time for making the application, subject to such conditions (if any) as they think fit to impose.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

EARL WINTERTON said this Amendment was put down in pursuance of a pledge given by the hon. and learned Gentleman that he would make this clause more elastic. He would suggest that some of the words were very vague. It made it rather difficult for the Court to know exactly what was in the mind of the Legislature when it passed the clause, and it left the onus of construing the idea of the legislative mind upon the Court or authority that had to carry out the Act. He asked the Solicitor-General to explain what he meant by the word "conditions."

SIR S. EVANS said the sub-clause to which the Amendments related was a clause on which much discussion arose as to the hardship that might be entailed, supposing the secretary of a registered club had omitted, quite inadvertently, to apply for registration at the proper time. He had promised to insert words providing that through such inadvertence the club should not cease to be a registered club, and to make it clear to the justices that the club should be registered notwithstanding the lapse of time before the application was made, and should be registered under such conditions as the justices thought fit.

SIR F. BANBURY complained that the Solicitor-General had not given the explanation asked for. The hon. and learned Gentleman had been asked to state what was the meaning of the word "conditions," and he had carefully evaded that point altogether. "Conditions" might mean anything. They might have a bench of magistrates, the majority of whom were teetotal fanatics, and who might impose any conditions they liked under the clause. The words of the Amendment were—

"Subject to such conditions, if any, as they think fit to impose."

The magistrates might refuse to register them unless they made an entirely new structure or it might be the case of a back door, and they would refuse to grant a renewal unless the door was closed. He thought unless they got some explanation from the Solicitor-General as to what the words meant they ought to divide against the Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said it was very difficult to follow some of the Amendments, and he confessed that it was difficult to follow this one. For instance as to the word "they," he could not in the whole sentence find a word in the plural to which that would apply. If they read the words through, "they" referred to the only plural word which preceded it, namely "conditions." It was perfectly evident, if that was the case, that the clause would be nonsense. He thought that it must refer to the Court who imposed the conditions. When the Court was being asked to make exceptions in favour of a club which had neglected to comply with the law, it was reasonable that the Court should have power to insert some condition, such as carrying out the formalities within seven days, or some condition of that sort. He did not think that these conditions referred in any way to the structure of the premises; they simply referred to the conditions on which the renewal, though out of time, were granted. If that were so, he thought that the Solicitor-General might substitute the word "Court" for "they," and the clause would then read perfectly sensibly, and the whole set of Amendments be carried out in an excellent way.

SIR S. EVANS: I do not think the word "conditions" is fitted by the word "they" at all.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: The word "Court" would make sense of it.

SIR S. EVANS: I think it is quite good sense and good grammar now.

*COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes) pointed out that "they" was governed by the whole of the section, and the word "Court" ought to be substituted for "they." He moved to substitute the word "Court," for "they."

SIR S. EVANS: I accept the Amendment, but I do not accept the criticism. The words "the Court" would have to be substituted—"the Court think."

COLONEL WALKER moved to insert the words "the Court" accordingly.

Amendment to the Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the word 'they' and insert the words 'the Court.'"—(*Colonel Walker.*)

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he wanted to draw the attention of the Government to the real point raised on this Amendment. Supposing a club through inadvertence at the end of twenty-one days had failed to register, by the time it went to Court it would have incurred various pains and penalties from 21st of January until the time it went into Court. As he understood the discussion, they wanted to know whether there was not some way of protecting the club secretary who, through simple inadvertence, had omitted to make his application, from any penalties that might exist under the law. He understood that it was on that point the Solicitor-General was to prepare an Amendment. The present Amendment was no more in favour of the secretary than was the original Bill. The Bill said that—

"The club shall cease to be a registered club as from the expiration of the time within which the application for renewal may be made unless the Court is satisfied that the application was not made through inadvertence."

All that was done by the Amendment was that the Court might simply extend the time of application on such conditions as they thought fit. The club ceased to be registered on 21st of January, and if application was not made until the 8th, then in the meantime these penalties would have been incurred, but what they desired was that the club should be exempted from them. He ventured to submit that the words of the Amendment did not carry out any useful purpose from that point of view.

SIR S. EVANS: There was a little discussion upon this particular point, and questions were asked by several Members on this side of the House as to what would be the effect on a club which remained unregistered. This Amendment does not deal with a case of that kind, and it is not necessary to deal with it, and I so expressed my opinion at the time. On an application to extend the time being granted, the club is in exactly the same position as if it had been registered. Supposing a club through inadvertence was not registered, and the secretary was threatened with a prosecution, if an application to extend the time were granted there would be no penalties incurred in the meantime.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 24, to leave out the words 'licensing justices,' and to insert the word 'Court.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for East Somerset, next on the Paper, is not in order, not being within the scope of the clause.

EARL WINTERTON moved to leave out Clause 37. He did not, he said, necessarily object to the whole of the clause, but hon. friends on that side of the House desired to raise one or two points which could be very well discussed on the clause as a whole. The first point to which he wished to refer was one which they had discussed in Committee without coming to any definite conclusion, having been unable to arrive at any agreement as to the meaning of the words, "to be used mainly as a drinking club." Those words, as he understood, were in no way qualified or affected by the Amendments. Both sides of the

House were anxious to arrive at some understanding or agreement as to what was really meant by a drinking club. The words were capable of any kind of interpretation. A bench of magistrates who held that clubs were undesirable might interpret the words to mean that any club where liquor was sold was used mainly as a drinking club. Another bench, who thought there was no harm in selling drink in clubs—it might be urged that such a thing was not likely—might hold that a club where drink was sold did not make it a place where drink was unduly consumed. It seemed to him that from every point of view this form of words was wholly undesirable. If they placed restrictions upon drinking on licensed premises, they ought to put as far as they could every restriction upon illegitimate drinking on unlicensed premises. He was perfectly sincere when he said that he and his friends were just as anxious as hon. Members opposite to prevent any of the clubs which were springing up so rapidly from becoming drinking clubs. The question was whether these words would carry out the intentions of the Government. He thought that in the time which had elapsed between the Committee and Report stages of the Bill the Government might have found some words which would have more definitely described what was meant by a drinking club. There was one other point he wished to refer to in connection with these words "mainly used as drinking clubs." As he understood it, and he had heard nothing to the contrary, sergeants' messes in Territorial Army camps would come under the provisions of this clause. Not only was that so, but a club held for non-commissioned officers and men in a drill hall connected with a territorial regiment and used, perhaps, only during two or three nights a week in the winter months, would also come under the clause. When they raised this matter in Committee, the learned Solicitor-General gave a very sympathetic answer, and it was one of the many points connected with the difficulties of this club question upon which, apparently, no one on the other side of the House could give a definite answer. It was only the most extreme temperance advocates who would object to such clubs as these. They were of vast importance to the efficiency of the territorial regiments, inasmuch as they enable the non-commissioned officers to come together for instruction classes and to discuss matters connected with the administration and organisation of the corps. In any case, even if it were urged that abuses might sometimes arise in connection with these clubs, he did not think that they should come under the club clauses of this Bill, and for this reason: The whole idea of the new Territorial Forces was that the commanding officers should be solely responsible for what went on in their respective regiments, and so in the case of these clubs it was the commanding officer who should be held responsible, and they should not be classed within the club clauses. He would like to know what opinion the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite had upon this matter, and what the intentions of the Government with respect to it were. To return again to his first point he would appeal to the Government to give some better definition of a "drinking club," because unless that was done they would have a condition of affairs which would be far worse than anything which had taken place at the present time, and far worse than anything which the greatest pessimist had so far ventured to prophesy. Indeed, they might even get that condition of affairs which they were all so anxious to avoid; he meant a species, he would not say of blackmail, but of "log rolling"; of getting certain clubs kept upon the register, and others taken off. If these words remained in the Bill, the result would be disastrous.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said his objection to the clause was that it commenced with the words "any person may within fourteen days," and so on, and the result of that was that the whole clause invited any people to object to the registration of clubs. They knew perfectly well what would happen in a good many districts if the clause became law. Unfortunately, people were so constituted that in almost every district where there were clubs, some individuals would be found who had so much prejudice with regard to supplying intoxicating liquor, that they might be relied upon to object wholesale to the renewal of the licences of all clubs which sold intoxicating liquor, and these clubs might be driven every year to contest a case before the Courts, and to prove that they were not used mainly as drinking clubs. They would probably have to produce their accounts in Court and show the amount of their subscriptions, and the amount expended in intoxicating liquor, and they would generally have to show what they gave for it, whom they bought it from, and how much they got for it. Information of that sort might be of considerable use to political opponents, and to opposition clubs, and it might lead to the annoyance and inconvenience of any club, however respectably conducted; in fact, the effect of the clause would be that the whole of the clubs in any district in the kingdom would be practically at the mercy of any common informer who chose, having a fad or political prejudice, to lodge this fourteen days notice of objection. He hoped after the discussion in Committee the Government would have seen their way to bring up some Amendment, but he could not see that there was any alteration with regard to that part of the clause. It was still left open to the common informer to make his objection. If somebody was really going to object *bona fide* to the registration of a club, he ought to give some security or show he had some right to object, or give some *prima facie* case. For instance, if an information had to be laid and two magistrates had to grant a summons on a sworn information that the club was being used for some irregular purpose, undoubtedly it would very materially improve the position, but he gathered that none of the Government Amendments went in any way towards that point and that the whole clause was still left to the common informer. His next objection on the merits of the clause related to the words "a drinking club." In dealing with Bills of this kind they were used to the coining of new expressions. They had one here. A drinking club meant a place where the members mainly drank. He had taken the precaution to obtain the accounts of two or three clubs in the West End of London, and it was a fact that the principal expenses and receipts in two of those clubs came under the heading of drink. He would not mention the names of those clubs, but he was willing to furnish them to the Solicitor-General privately. He was sure that if he mentioned the names it would be at once conceded by everybody that there was not the slightest risk of anyone calling them drinking clubs. What was to be the criterion of a drinking club which would be tried upon the information of the common informer? The principal takings were tobacco, drinks, mineral waters, meals, billiards and other games. He suggested that there was hardly a club in the kingdom conducted under such circumstances in which intoxicating drink would not be the largest item. It might be contended upon the production of the accounts of such a club that it was mainly a drinking club because drink would be the principal item in the expenses and receipts. The same would apply to the clubs in Pall Mall. It should not be forgotten that working men's clubs were used principally in the evening and the members went there after their last daily meal. Very often they played cards, dominoes, and billiards, and if they had any outlay at all it was nearly always upon a drink. Under those circumstances practically the whole receipts would be for drink. Would such places be considered as "mainly used as a drinking club"? It was a most unfortunate expression and after the criticism passed upon it in Committee he thought on this point the Government should have seen their way to have given some better definition than one which would render a club liable to be disqualified if its largest item of the receipts happened to be for drink. If drunkenness or excessive drinking by the individual could be proved to have taken place, he thought such a club should be dealt with in the same way as a licensed house would be dealt with; it ought to be closed. Supposing a club was used by working men and the accounts contained as the principal item drink. Why should a common informer under those circumstances be able to annoy that club? That was a most unreasonable proposition. Most of the Amendments put down seemed to be reasonable, but he seconded the omission of this clause, because he considered it was a most objectionable one in regard to the points he had indicated.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 25, to leave out Clause 37.'"—(*Earl Winterton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'any person,' stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said that when this Bill was before the Committee his colleagues in the House took a considerable interest in Clause 37. They did so because they suspected very much the general powers of objection given under the clause, and they proposed that some sort of guarantee for the *bona fides* of the objector should be inserted. Their suggestion was that the Chief Constable should make himself responsible for passing on those objections. He was bound to admit that the answer of the Government to that suggestion convinced them that it was not altogether a happy one. Still they had in their minds that good clubs, honestly conducted, might be hardly dealt with if the common informer was encouraged to put clubs in the position of having to defend themselves. The next suggestion they made was that if any person felt obliged to enter an objection, that person, if the Court desired, might be compelled to find security for the costs. That suggestion had been adopted, and there was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the Solicitor-General carrying this out which, in due course, the House would be asked to vote upon. To that extent the Labour Party had been met and they were satisfied. The difficulty in a case like this was that unless they made it tolerably easy to lay objections to clubs a bad club undoubtedly would escape. He felt quite certain that no section of the House desired that bad clubs should go on, and, therefore, a certain amount of ease must be allowed for making objections. On the other hand, the *bona fide* clubs must be protected against frivolous objections by security being given for costs. The Amendment they were going to discuss provided that security for costs might be asked by the Court, and that would amply meet the case. He wished to state that the Club and Institute Union Executive was, on the whole, willing to accept the clause with that Amendment inserted. With reference to the other point raised in the speech of the hon. Member for the West Derby division of Liverpool as to the use of the word "mainly," here again there was a great difficulty. When the Bill was first printed conferences took place between the Labour Party and the Club and Institute Union Executive, and this word "mainly" was pitched upon and objected to. From that time to the present attempts had been made to discover either a word or a formula which would carry out the intention which he felt sure was shared by all sections of the House to rule out the drinking clubs, but up to the present moment the most successful suggestion was that made by the Government, namely, the use of the word "mainly." He was not at all afraid of the word "mainly," because its interpretation could not possibly be given by any Court simply after a mere examination of the income of a club. The income was only one of very many circumstances which a Court would have to take into consideration. A club might exist for social purposes; it might have swimming, shooting, fishing, and reading clubs, billiards, and so on, but it might be that the only article sold to any extent would be drink. Obviously a Court in considering whether a club was "mainly used as a drinking club" would consider all those other adjuncts of the club such as reading and recreation, and so on, and those facts must be accepted as evidence regarding the purpose and meaning of a club and not merely an examination of the income and the balance sheets. The word "mainly" evidently indicated not income but intention, and what a Court was directed to do by Clause 37 and by this particular expression was to consider what was the purpose of the clubs and in doing that it must accept evidence as to all the activities connected with club. If the only activity was that numbers of men entered its doors to be supplied with drink and nothing else then that club was used "mainly as a drinking club" and that was the sort of club which nobody in the House desired to see continued. On the other hand, if the members entered the doors of the club for the purpose of taking part in rational recreation, even if it was not intellectually high, then the Court was bound to decide accordingly, and refuse to disallow the existence of such a club. Over and above that there was an appeal provided for in the clause. He knew that appeal was not in practice a very good safeguard, but nevertheless, it was there and it might be used. In consequence of the further consideration of Clause 37 and the removal of the difficulties which existed at the earlier stages of the consideration of the Bill, he for one was prepared to accept it now, more particularly with the various Amendments in the name of the Solicitor-General. He should certainly vote against the Amendment now before the House.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said he was decidedly against the words "any person," because it seemed to him that that phrase would cause an enormous amount of trouble, and have the effect of preventing members of a club turning out people they wanted to get rid of. Working men had told him that some members of a club might be turned out because they were in the habit of getting too much to drink at the club. Those members would be sure to be vindictive for a time, and they might, by lodging an objection, cause an enormous amount of trouble and friction amongst the members of the club. He certainly thought this ought to be altered. Some person like the chief constable ought to be definitely stated in the clause. One of the things working men in his part of the world objected to most of all was that objection could be taken to registration or renewal of registration on the ground that a club "is used or is to be used mainly as a drinking club." That would be very difficult to define. If there was no drink allowed to be sold in West End clubs, there would not be many clubs. It might also be said that a good many clubs all over the country would never have been brought into existence if they were not allowed to sell drink. He fancied that if there was no drink sold in the Reform Club, a good many people would be very glad to be made honorary members of the Carlton Club. Unless it was laid down definitely what a drinking club was there might be a good many frivolous objections.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL: Perhaps it will be convenient if I say now a few words on the points so far raised in regard to this clause. As to the first point, with reference to the words "any person," there was a prolonged discussion on the Committee stage. We hold that clubs, by the new subsection added to the clause to enable the Court to order security for costs, will be amply safeguarded against the frivolous objector. We are glad to learn from the hon. Member for Leicester that the Club and Institute Union, a body which has taken a very great interest in this part of the Bill, is satisfied with the safeguard provided by the subsection. I would point out that the words "any person" appear in the Act of 1902 in reference to clubs. The matter was fully discussed by Parliament then, and it was decided after long deliberation that it was a desirable thing to give any person the right to object to the registration of a club. Further I would remind the House that the words "any person" appear in the Licensing Acts, and at the present time any common informer may bring an objection to any licence—not merely a public-house licence, but the licence of the largest hotel in this city. In view of the fact that costs may be given against a frivolous objector, that there is a judicial tribunal to decide these matters, and that there is an appeal, the clause is not open to objection on the ground that it contains the words "any person." Again the words "is used or is to be used mainly as a drinking club" have been made the subject of criticism. The noble Lord the Member for the Horsham division said it was perfectly impossible to interpret words of that character.

Earl WINTERTON: I was not necessarily blaming the Government. I admitted that there was very great difficulty in getting words to express the intention which the House wished to carry out.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I think the noble Lord also said that the words could not be properly interpreted. I would point out that the late Government passed three measures dealing with clubs. The English Act did not contain those particular words, but both the Scottish and the Irish Acts did include as a reason of objection that clubs were mainly used for the sale of excisable liquors. The distinction between the two forms of words is so fine that no argument can be based on the distinction. If it is right to object to a club because it is mainly used for the sale of excisable liquors, it is also right to object to one because it is used mainly as a drinking club. Cases have been taken and decided in Scotland on those very words, and clubs have been struck off the register on the ground that they were mainly used for the supply of excisable liquors. No Amendment appears on the Paper in the name of any hon. Member suggesting any alternative or better form of words than those in the clause, and I think in the circumstances we may justly ask the House to adhere to the phraseology we use. It is unwise to fetter, if it can be avoided, the discretion of the Courts in this matter. What we want to do is to suppress clubs which are mainly drinking clubs, and the simplest way is to say so in the Act of Parliament. The question of canteens will be dealt with by the Solicitor-General.

*MR. JAMES PARKER (Halifax) agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it was difficult to find a word to take the place of "mainly" in this connection. He and his friends had puzzled over the matter, and they came to the conclusion that it was hopeless to find a word which, for the purpose of expressing what was intended, did not go too far either in one direction or the other. The hon. Member for the West Derby Division seemed to suggest that the only kind of clubs which existed among the working classes were purely drinking clubs. He could assure the hon. Member that there were clubs of quite a different kind, where meetings of all sorts were held. There was a good number of such clubs throughout the country. These clubs could not be properly judged by the question of income. He had a club in his mind whose total income from drink amounted to less than a penny per head per week, and the membership was 11,000. He would have liked to see a clearer definition than "mainly a drinking club," but at the same time he accepted in good faith the assurance of the Government that they had done all they could to meet the difficulty. He had given notice of an Amendment on Clause 38 for the purpose of providing that the penalties specified should not be imposed unless it was shown to the Court that there had been "repeated" drunkenness on the premises of a club. As that Amendment was not likely to be reached before the closure resolution began to operate, he asked whether the Government would be able to accept it. By doing so they would not be giving away anything in the Bill in so far as it made for temperance.

*MR. GRETTON said a more adequate explanation should be given than that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to the meaning of the words "mainly as a drinking club." What was to be the test whether it was mainly a drinking club or not? It was a matter of common knowledge that a large number of clubs in this country derived a considerable portion of their revenue from the sale of alcoholic liquors and temperance drinks. If they were not allowed to sell drink, they must in some cases cease to exist. Was the question whether or not a club could maintain its existence in the absence of the sale of alcoholic stimulants to be the test applied by the Government as to whether a club was mainly for drinking? If that was to be the test, there would be some curious results. It would extinguish the vast majority of the clubs of the working classes, and a large number of political clubs attached to both sides. It would also hit some of the larger clubs. He would remind hon. Members opposite that it appeared from the financial statement of the National Liberal Club that it derived an income from the sale of alcoholic stimulants of about £8,500. In the absence of the profit on these sales the balance of the club would have been on the wrong side. If that was not to be the test for maintaining the existence of a club what was the test to be? At an early stage of the debate he asked whether military messes and clubs attached to the headquarters of the Yeomanry and the Territorial Infantry would be exempted from the obligations imposed by the clubs. Of course, it was notorious that those clubs were not drinking clubs, but he thought that it would be impossible for them to continue to exist if they required to register under the Bill. Military clubs were carried on under military law; they were largely under the control of the local commanding officer. There was no secretary as a rule; the sale of alcoholic liquor was not in the hands of a committee; and in all these respects the clubs were not under the control of a committee such as was required of ordinary clubs under the Act of 1902. He thought the House should have some explanation from the law officers of the Crown as to whether messes attached not only to the Regular military forces but to the Territorial Forces, would be brought within the provisions of this clause. If there was any confusion or doubt with regard to that point, it would place such messes and clubs in a most difficult and onerous position. The clause was vague and unsatisfactory as it stood, and before they on that side of the House could allow it to pass they should have a fuller explanation than they had yet got on the two points which he had raised.

Mr. HART-DAVIES pointed out that the Working Men's Club and Institute Union were not dissatisfied with this clause as it now stood.

Earl WINTERTON: Will the hon. Gentleman describe what is "mainly a drinking club"?

Mr. HART-DAVIES said he could only describe a club which was mainly a drinking club as just a club mainly used as a drinking club. The words were simple and perfectly intelligible. He was sure that every member of a working men's club knew what was "mainly a drinking club"—a club where the amount of money raised from drink was more than was derived from other sources. He suggested that as the working-men's clubs themselves did not raise any objections to this clause as a whole, the House should pass it and get to other Amendments which were more important.

Sir E. CARSON: The hon. Member who has just addressed the House said that the Working Mens' Club and Institute Union was satisfied with this clause, that that is enough, and he cannot understand why it should want any discussion. Well, we do not all hold briefs, if I might say so, for this particular club and institute union. It seems to me to be very easily satisfied. I do not know on what representations they were satisfied as to the meaning of this clause, but I deny that their rights are absolutely protected under it. It was said that there was security for their obtaining costs against "any person" who unsuccessfully laid an information against the club; but I do not think that the clause provides a very satisfactory method of securing protection against the common informer. Hon. Members opposite do not seem to have the least difficulty in construeing the words "mainly used as a drinking club." Has it occurred to these Gentlemen that at the present moment a drinking club can be prosecuted for selling drink without a licence? And as this clause does not deal with such a case on the ground that it is covered by the ordinary law, what is it that the Government have in their mind as to what is "mainly used as a drinking club," and upon what criteria are you to determine this knotty point of law? The Solicitor-General has told us what criterion he would lay down; and an hon. Member put it that if it was found that the main income of the club was derived from the sale of drink that would be a club mainly used as a drinking club. It is quite clear that nobody wants to put an end to the National Liberal Club, or any other respectable political club; but what is the criterion which would lead a magistrate to decide one way or the other whether a club is used mainly as a drinking club? Is the criterion to be whether or not the main income of the club is derived from drinks, or whether more whiskey and beer are consumed than coffee and soda water? What is the exact measure of drink to be consumed in a club that turns it into "mainly a drinking club"? All I can say is that I do not know. Therefore, it seems to me that we should give a little more time to the consideration of what is the meaning of the word "mainly." I had a communication sent to me from a club—I do not know of what political persuasion it is—in which it was stated that artists of very high eminence were to appear in the club on a Sunday morning and give an entertainment. It is quite true that the artists were to get £5 5s. for appearing there; but am I to maintain that that is a club mainly used for the purpose of entertaining? The truth of the matter is, that I believe you will lead to all sorts of confusion. It is far better to leave the law as it is and to keep to your police and the people interested—not the common informer. Make the police do their duty and go into these houses, which everybody knows are unlicensed houses selling drink, and deal with them under the ordinary law, and not have these plausible pretexts for saying they are used mainly as a drinking club. Rigorously enforce the law. What we all want in this matter is to protect the *bona fide* club, and I say it is protected by the law as it stands, and that there is absolutely sufficient law for the purpose of dealing with these clubs which are not *bona fide* clubs. To leave it to the Courts to determine in any way they please the meaning of words you are unable to define, and without giving them definite criteria which are to enable them properly to interpret the words of the statute is, I say, shirking our responsibility. If we are not able to determine the circumstances under which a club ought to be held to be mainly a drinking club, it is far better to leave it alone and trust to the common law tribunal to deal with the question.

Sir S. EVANS: The right hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to certain proceedings which he said might be taken at common law, which I have never heard of till the present moment. He says that if a club exists now and nothing but drinking goes on there, you can prosecute it for selling beer without a licence. That is not an offence at common law. If you sell drink on any premises without a licence you are amenable to the common law, but immediately you get a club there is no sale of drink at all, and the right hon. Gentleman knows that perfectly. You cannot prosecute a club for selling drink on its premises. Does the right hon. Gentleman say that if an association of people, occupying convenient premises, formed an association for the purposes of drinking and nothing else, pledging themselves to drink as much as they can hold without getting drunk, and to have occasional drunkenness on the premises—does he say that you can put that down under the Act of 1902?

Sir E. CARSON: It may be put down under the ordinary common law.

Sir S. EVANS: I have never heard of such a case.

Sir E. CARSON: Because such a case has never arisen.

Sir S. EVANS: I have never known of proceedings being taken under the ordinary law.

Sir E. CARSON: Does the hon. and learned Gentleman mean to deny, as Solicitor-General, that an association of men banded together for the purposes of getting drunk, that is for the purpose of committing a crime under the ordinary law, cannot be proceeded against?

Sir S. EVANS: The right hon. and learned Gentleman must take my words. I said "occasional drunkenness" in framing the case, because under the Act of 1902 the words used are "frequent drunkenness." I say that an association of people banding themselves together, occupying convenient premises, as an association for drinking, pledging themselves to drink in large quantities without getting drunk, though occasionally getting drunk, cannot be touched under the ordinary law or under the Act of 1902. The right hon. Gentleman asks for a definition of the words "used mainly as a drinking club," but surely it is hardly necessary for me again to say that that is a question of fact, and a matter which is not capable of legal definition. I observe in the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman himself, which he has just delivered, a couple of phrases. I want to ask him what is the meaning of those phrases, and what is the criteria of judging. He alludes to a "reasonably conducted club"; but who is to decide but the tribunal before which the case comes? He used the phrase "a *bona fide* club." Who is to decide? These are pure questions of fact, easy to determine, and in the determination of which no bench of magistrates can find any difficulty whatever.

SIR E. CARSON: I do not agree with that.

SIR S. EVANS: At any rate that is my opinion, and I have asked in vain in the course of this discussion for the right hon. Gentleman, or anybody who is associated with him, to tell the House what they meant in the Scottish Act and the Irish Act when they used the words "mainly used for the supply of excisable liquor."

SIR E. CARSON: Will you accept those words?

SIR S. EVANS: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly tell me what they mean?

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): I told you on the last occasion and I proposed very strongly an Amendment of the Bill, but you would not accept the words.

SIR S. EVANS: What is the use of accepting in substitution of those which we have put in the Bill which are easy of interpretation, words which raise precisely the same difficulty? The word "mainly" is the only word which is supposed to raise any difficulty at all, and the difficulty is found not only in our Bill but in the Scottish and Irish Acts of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The right hon. Gentleman has asked why it is that the Club and Institute Union have expressed their satisfaction through those who speak on their behalf in this House. They have expressed their satisfaction because we have put some precautions in this Bill which shows that we do not desire to interfere with clubs properly carried on. That is the only reason why. They are satisfied with the provisions of the Amendments which we have put in giving protection from undue interference, and because we have provided that security for costs shall be required from an objector. The right hon. Gentleman said that costs are very often irrecoverable, but what we have enabled the justices to say is that there must be security for costs, and have not merely given them the power to inflict costs at the end of the charge. Before anyone lays an information against a club he can be required to give security for costs, so that if it turns out upon investigation that the circumstances of which he complains have no foundations, those costs will be there by the order of the justices to be handed over to the persons damnified by his taking proceedings. I said at the beginning, both inside the House and outside it, that the provisions dealing with clubs were not intended to hurt or to be prejudicial in any degree to *bona fide* clubs, whether they were workmen's or any other kind of club. We want to destroy and prevent the creation of merely drinking clubs in substitution for public-houses. I have been asked as to the meaning of the words "is to be used as a club." If immediately a tied house, to which a licence was attached, is shut up by the operation of the law, in the same street two or three doors off premises are taken by the brewer, who forms a club with all formality, so that you cannot tell it is not a club, we say it is quite easy to bring facts forward, and we give the justices discretion to say that that is not a proper club, but is to be mainly used as a drinking club, and if they say that they can prevent its being opened or can shut it if it is opened. There is no power under the Act of 1902 to prevent the registration of such a club; it must take place automatically. What do you have now? You have the club opened although it may be common knowledge what it is going to be, but you must allow it to be opened and for some time you must collect your evidence, and a great deal of time may elapse and a great deal of mischief may be done, before you can prevent the registration of that club automatically taking place. That is my answer to the right hon. Gentleman as to clubs, and I have answered warmly, because I cannot understand the complaint that justices will not be able as commonsense men to decide upon evidence whether a club is mainly used as a drinking club or not. I have to answer a question by the hon. Member for Rutland, and a speech by the noble Lord, with regard to a matter upon which I do not feel as strongly as the criticism upon this subject. The question was raised suddenly during Committee by the hon. Member for Rutland, and he was good enough afterwards to send me a memorandum. It touches the *status* of messes and clubs in the Regular Army and the Territorial Force. I perused the memorandum, and I forwarded it to the authorities, and what I am going to say now is the result of consideration, not only by the Government but also by the authorities. The question of officers' and sergeants' messes of the Regular Army has been raised by the War Office with the Home Office, and a reply has been received that the Act of 1902 does not apply, and that they will not be affected by the present Bill. The question of authorising sergeants' messes in the Territorial Force was raised by the Territorial Force branch at the time the Territorial Force Regulations were being framed. It was not considered advisable to draw up special regulations, or to give general War Office authority for their formation. The present Paragraph 136, Territorial Force Regulations, throws the responsibility for proper initiation and subsequent management upon officers commanding units. If a sergeants' mess is established in a unit under the authority of the commanding officer that officer will be responsible that it is organised on the lines laid down in the King's Regulations, that discipline is maintained, and that the accounts are properly kept and audited. The mess president of an officers' mess is not appointed by the officers, but is or should be detailed by the commanding officer, but there is really very little similarity between the officers' and sergeants' messes of the Regular Army and those of the Territorial Force. In the former the mess is the home of all unmarried members; in the latter it only becomes a "mess" in the proper sense of the word for a few days in the year, and during the remainder of the year is to all intents and purposes a club. Another point is that in comparatively few Territorial Force units can such institutions exist. They will only be found in the large towns where corps have command of a good deal of money, and the members are concentrated. In "country" corps they are practically non-existent. The carrying on of the sergeants' messes in the Territorial Force on the lines of the King's Regulations was only contemplated when a unit was out for training, and not during the whole year. It would not be possible during non-training to exercise the supervision demanded by the King's Regulations. The authorities have since been advised that the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, has not altered the *status* of these messes and canteens and does not affect them. There is no equivalent to a regimental club in in the Regular Army. The regimental institutes of the latter are not analogous. The authorities think that it is very doubtful if it is advisable to exempt Territorial Force officers' and sergeants' messes from the provisions of the present Bill—that is, to recognise them as "messes" rather than as "clubs"—the reason being that to all intents and purposes in the corps where they exist permanently they are practically clubs, and it would be impossible to apply the disciplinary provisions of the King's Regulations to them, except during training. If they are excepted from the provisions of the Bill then the onus for their proper management must eventually fall on the War Office. At the present time when Territorial Force units are out for training, the officers' and sergeants' messes and the mens' canteens are run by contract for the time being, and the contractors arrange for the necessary licence. The authorities think that there is no reason to alter the present system, and where permanent messes exist it would be better to treat them as clubs under the Act, which they are to all intents and purposes, rather than attempt their management as regular messes under modified conditions. I said when we were discussing this matter that we did not propose to alter the law, and I have the authority of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War for saying that he does not consider that the law which at present applies to clubs where they are clubs has been changed by anything that has happened since the Act of 1902.

*MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said a great deal of use had been made of the statement that the Club and Institute Union had agreed to this clause. He supposed that statement was founded on some sort of agreement, or conversation with some official of the Union. He would, however, remind the House that the Club and Institute Union did not represent all the clubs in the country and he knew that a great many were not satisfied. He had within the last ten minutes read a letter from a prominent official of the Club and Institute Union, expressing great dissatisfaction with the Bill as it stood, and with the Amendments put on the Paper by the Government. Therefore, he did not think it right that the House should be given to understand that the clause as proposed to be amended was acceptable to the clubs as a whole. The question which the justices would have to decide was: "What is the purpose and intention of the club?" That was not a question of fact, it was a question of opinion. Very different opinions might be formed on the same set of facts. The only facts that could be brought to the notice of the justices were the number of members, the balance sheet, and the general conduct of the club. Where a club existed for a perfectly *bona fide* purpose, but where its continued existence was only possible through the profit made on drink, there was a grave danger that the justices might be prejudiced by the figures of the sales of alcoholic refreshment and might make harsh conditions against useful and perfectly justifiable institutions. Another point which had not been sufficiently touched on arose under the final lines of the first subsection—

> "On the ground that the club is bound by any covenant, agreement, or undertaking, or is otherwise under an obligation to obtain a supply of any intoxicating liquor from any particular person not being a club which was so bound or under such an obligation before the passing of this Act."

That would prevent the universal custom of all the best social clubs. He undertook to say that all the best clubs contracted for the supply of wines which they had bought as they matured, particularly port. Contracts were entered into for port years before it matured, because it was manifestly impossible for the clubs to mature it in their own cellars. That was an agreement "to obtain a supply" entered into for mutual advantage but did not make the club a tied club in an objectionable sense.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: There is an Amendment on the Paper.

*MR. COURTHOPE said he did not think the Amendment of the Solicitor-General covered that, but if it did that was sufficient. Then there was the question of military messes and canteens. The ignorance of the War Office as just displayed by the Memorandum which had been read by the Solicitor-General was absolutely incredible. He knew there was a good deal of ignorance in that Department of the State, but that which had been displayed over this matter of the sergeants' messes was positively amazing. The Solicitor-General had just read to the House that, in the opinion of the War Office, these messes were few and far between, and in connection with the Territorial Army were only possible in the large towns where the battalions were possessed of great wealth. That was absolutely wrong, for every Territorial battalion had them. He knew a case of a battalion which had five or six such messes situate at the headquarters of the different companies. Wherever there was a drill hall there was some arrangement for a mess of this character. There were no rules as to whether such messes should be open or closed at particular times, nor had they any secretaries. Their opening was entirely under the discretion of the commanding officer. Sometimes weeks elapsed between the dates of opening, and very often they were opened at most irregular hours. He had experienced a case of this quite recently, when one of these messes was opened, and quite rightly so, between the hours of three and four in the morning, after the men had returned from night manœuvres. If a bench of magistrates were told that the mess was opened at such an hour, their hair would stand on end. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that these messes were not excluded from the Act of 1902. but it was a remarkable thing the military canteens, and military canteens only were excluded and sergeants' messes were not.

SIR S. EVANS: That was with reference to justices' licences.

*MR. COURTHOPE said that was quite true, but he contended that that was an argument in his favour and that there was very great risk as the law stood that these messes were clubs and that these restrictions might apply to them. He hoped the Solicitor-General would refer the Memorandum of the War Office back again to that Department, with an instruction that officers of the Territorial Forces in the House complained that the information upon which the Memorandum was based must have been obtained from someone entirely ignorant of the facts. With regard to another statement made in the document, it was not true that these messes were invariably run by contractors. On the contrary they were often run by the regiment concerned. A mess in the Territorial Army was often run by some one in the regiment. He had run one himself. All these points clearly tended to show that the War Office advisers were not to be trusted, and that the matter should be reconsidered, and submitted to some authority who not only understood the practice but was competent to interpret the law. He would conclude by again pressing the Solicitor-General to reconsider the question whether an express exclusion could not be provided for in another place. If anyone chose to bring up a case against these messes and the Court held they were clubs, within the present law, everyone of them would be seriously hit, because they did not comply with the conditions with which the ordinary club had to comply. It was really a serious matter, and he thought the naval and military forces might well demand that the matter should have reconsideration.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that in reply to the hon. Member for Rye, he might say that he had a letter from the secretary of the Club and Institute Union in reply to one which he wrote asking him for his remarks on the Bill as it stood for consideration on Report. The secretary of that union raised two objections in his letter. The first objection was to the Amendment which appeared in the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Windsor. He wrote—

> "But apart from that, there is but one matter in Report of interest to us."

That other matter was the point alluded to by the Solicitor-General. He asked that before the word "drunkenness" the word "frequent" should be introduced, stating that under the Bill as at present drafted a single case of drunkenness might lead to every member of the committee being fined, and he pointed out that in Section 28 of the Act of 1902 the offence was "frequent drunkenness." Those were the only two objections raised by the secretary of the Club and Institute Union, and, although it was true the union was not representative of all, it represented between 1,100 and 1,200 clubs in the country. He had had a good deal to do with clubs; and, for his part, he did not think there was any possible way of defining the word "mainly" except by a reference to the intention in the future on the one hand and to the facts in the present and past on the other. He would remind the House that in no less than three different places in the Peel Report the word "merely" or "solely" was used. It was quite true that the word "mainly" was not used in that Report; but a sufficient answer to that, as the Solicitor-General had said, was that the word "mainly" appeared in both the Scottish and Irish Acts.

SIR F. BANBURY said that his hon. friend the Member for Rye had appealed to the Solicitor-General to ask the War Office to reconsider the opinion they had given, and he understood the hon. and learned Gentleman to signify his willingness to comply with that request. They were, however, now on the last day of the Report stage of the Bill, and, however much the War Office might reconsider their opinion, they would have no opportunity of giving effect to their reconsideration unless the Solicitor-General to-morrow moved to recommit the Bill.

SIR S. EVANS said he was asked by the hon. Member for Rye to bring the matter before the War Office, so that an Amendment might be made in another place.

SIR F. BANBURY said the Government were again to rely upon the other place, and he congratulated them upon not taking advantage of a certain Resolution of two years ago, and abolishing the other place. The clause said that any person might within fourteen days after the publication, etc., lodge, with the clerk of the Court, a notice of objection on the ground that the club was used "or is to be used" mainly as a drinking club. How on earth was anybody going to know what would happen in the future? He attached very great weight to the opinion of the Solicitor-General, but he did not believe he was a prophet, and an ordinary common informer could not possibly know that a club which was being started was going to be used mainly as a drinking club. He really thought the words required some explanation. He was glad to have the statement of the Solicitor-General that there was an Amendment on the Paper providing that the Court might insist upon security for costs being given; but there was nothing to say that that security must be given before listening to an informer, and the safeguard of the hon. and learned Gentleman therefore fell to the ground. There was another point to which the hon. Member for Rye had called attention, and the Under-Secretary said there was an Amendment on the Paper to deal with it. He ventured to say it did not deal with the point except that it would exempt the proprietor of a club who was the proprietor before the passing of the Act. The Carlton or any other club would not be able in the future to buy champagne or port for five or six years. All that was done was to exempt from any penalty the Carlton or any other club if they had already done so. Probably these would be the last remarks that he would be able to make upon the Bill, and he might perhaps be allowed to say that they were in greater confusion than they had been on any night—and that was saying a great deal—during the twenty-eight days the Bill had been discussed.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he did not know whether the Solicitor-General had read the whole of the Memorandum of the War Office, and he rose to ask that, in accordance with custom, the text of the Paper should be laid upon the Table of the House. The Solicitor-General shook his head, but he thought the Paper must be laid.

SIR S. EVANS: I read the whole of the material part of the Paper, and it will appear in *Hansard.*

LORD BALCARRES said he did not wish to press the hon. Gentleman unduly, but it was a matter of great importance, and he hoped at least the hon. Gentleman would undertake that in correcting his speech they should have a complete and official version of this very remarkable Memorandum.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 262; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 404.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyor
Benn, Sir J. William, (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Rom f'rd

Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt Hn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras.W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George

Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese.Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John, Herbert
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry

O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt. Henry A.

White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Slavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Earl Winterton and Mr. Courthope.

Sir F. BANBURY moved to leave out the word "mainly," so that the clause would read: "Club used or intended to be used as a drinking club." The reasons in favour of it seemed to be absolutely unanswerable. "A club to be used as a drinking club" would be understood by everyone. It would prevent briefs being given to the Solicitor-General and other ornaments of the profession, but the ordinary layman would be able to define what was meant by the Bill, and everyone would know what he was about.

Mr. G. D. FABER seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 29, to leave out the word 'mainly.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'mainly' stand part of the Bill."

Sir S. EVANS: I am not at all sure that the effect of the Amendment would not be entirely different from what the hon. Baronet thinks. I am not sure that it would not be the means of closing every club, but whether that is the effect or not there is hardly time to discuss now. It would give no briefs to lawyers. It raises no question of law but a mere question of fact, and we fortify ourselves in the use of this word, first of all, by saying it is a word which anyone of ordinary common sense could not fail to understand, and further we follow the most excellent example of the Government which passed the Scottish Act of 1902 and the Irish Act of 1903, which used the word "mainly." The hon. Baronet was a strong supporter of the Government of the day, and I do not recollect that he ever on any occasion raised any point that there would be any difficulty in understanding the meaning of the word "mainly."

EARL WINTERTON said that at last they understood the real difficulty that the Government were in. After waiting for the whole of the Committee and Report stages they understood that the meaning of the words "drinking club" might be that drinking clubs in which liquor was sold might be shut up. He was sure the clubs would be grateful to their intelligent representatives below the gangway.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 288; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 405.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. T. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S)
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jocoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport

against Hollesley Bay, so far as a beneficial return was concerned. Let them take a part he knew well, where the scheme had been carried out through the agency of the Local Government Board, and what applied in that case applied to almost every case in the land. They took a man who had been out of work for six or nine months, and who was, from privation, physically unfit to do a hard day's work. Probably he had lived on tea and bread, They put that man to a hard labourer's job with pick or shovel, and because he collapsed and was unable to do the work that an ordinary, well-fed labourer would do, they said the experiments with regard to unemployment were a failure, and this was urged as an excuse for not continuing them. They would have to look at the unemployed problem from an altogether different standpoint. They would have to recognise that in eight cases out of ten the unemployed worker was physically run down, and that he should be nursed for a week or a fortnight before they could expect him to do the work necessary to provide the satisfactory results required by some Members of the House. When the right hon. Gentleman said he would give them 50 per cent. more to make up any deficiency, that was not altogether satisfactory so far as dealing with this problem generally was concerned. He wanted the right hon. Gentleman to give a lead, and to deal with the unemployment problem from the standpoint he had indicated. So far as he had been able to tell from the financial standpoint and from the general result in regard to labour, there was every reason to be pleased at the results at Hollesley Bay; all that was wanted was a little more generous consideration by the Local Government Board, and he felt sure that if they would give it, Hollesley Bay would be before long an example of what might result from a somewhat generous treatment of the unemployed. He knew the statement was made that they were competing against local gardeners, and so forth, but the correspondence indicated that they were quite prepared for the Local Government Board to inspect the books and go fully into the matter, and they defied them to prove that they had competed with local gardeners or anyone else to their detriment. That being so, unless the Local Government Board were prepared to accept the invitation and go down to prove what they asserted, they ought not to continue to make the assertion. In regard to cost, he had figures which went to demonstrate that to maintain in that colony 1,597 persons for over twelve weeks, the cost worked out at something like £1 0s. 7d per head. He knew it had been contended that it was considerably more, but he contended that the charges put forward by the President of the Local Government Board in regard to the upkeep of the place ought not to be included. If it was treated on fair and proper lines that was something like the sum which went to keep a man and his family of five. It cost 14s. a week now in London to keep a pauper, and he was only a pauper at the end of the year. He had given no beneficial result to the nation. If they viewed it from the standpoint that they had to keep a man and his family at the rate of 14s. a week each, and they could get the result he had indicated at Hollesley Bay by the employment of unemployed labour at a cost of a little over £1, it was certainly to the benefit of the nation that they should spend the money in that direction rather than that they should continue to waste it on Poor Law administration. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give fair consideration and a fair trial to Hollesley Bay and allow the promoters of the experiment to demonstrate what might be done with the unemployed, and that he would be able to tell them that in addition to the £200,000 that he set aside for dealing with unemployment during the coming winter, legislation would be promoted which would indicate that they were beginning to view this question of unemployment in the light in which it ought to be viewed, and that there was some prospect of something like a permanent settlement of the question. He could not imagine that Members were prepared to continue spending the money they were spending in useless and temporary experiments. Instead of that he asked that they should endeavour to give the unemployed worker some security in regard to employment and give him some heart in his work. If they did that the results would be

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Sandys.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 32, to leave out the words 'as amended by this Act.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendment agreed to.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 17th July, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which Notice had been given, which were necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded at half-past Ten of the Clock this day, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 11th November.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 34, to leave out the word 'an,' and to insert the words 'any direct or indirect.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 294; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 406.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J.T. (Chesh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras. W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes

Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Lauceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt, Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorns, G. R. (Wolverhampt'n
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Harland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denision (York)
Faber, Capt W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks. William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt. Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Oddy, John James

Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry(Staff'sh.)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 34, after the word 'obligation,' to insert the words 'of any kind.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 295; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 407.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J. (S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell(Bristol,S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew,W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.]
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.

M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne,G.R. (Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.HnE. (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T.(West houghton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES — Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim, S.)
Craig, CaptainJames (Down,E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Keswick, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Pee
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col.W. H.(Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Forster and Lord Balcarres.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 20, line 35, to leave out the words 'not being,' and to insert the words 'by reason of that person having a proprietary interest in the club, or in the premises or furniture of the club, or being a creditor of the club, or being in any other manner in a position to control the supply of intoxicating liquor to the club; Provided that the last-mentioned ground of objection shall not apply in the case of.'"

"In page 20, line 39, at end, to insert the words 'and the Court may order the objection to be upheld or dismissed as they think fit.'"

"In page 21, line 32, at end, to add the words '(6) For the purpose of the provisions of this part of this Act relating to the registration, and the renewal of the registration of clubs, the expression "Court" means a Metropolitan Police Court as respects any place within the jurisdiction of such Court, a stipendiary magistrate as respects any place within the jurisdiction of such a magistrate, and as respects any other place a Court of Summary Jurisdiction having jurisdiction in that place. (7) Rules of Court may be made under Section twenty-nine of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, with respect to the procedure of the Court, and provision may be made by those rules enabling the Court, in such cases as they think fit, to order security for costs to be given by any objector. (8) The clerk to a stipendiary magistrate shall be substituted for the clerk to the justices as the person to keep the register of clubs under the Licensing Act, 1902, and to exercise and perform all powers and duties under that Act with respect to that register in any place within the jurisdiction of the magistrate, and the register and all other documents relating thereto shall accordingly, if not already in the possession of the clerk to the stipendiary magistrate, be handed over to him. (9) Where a Court of Summary Jurisdiction make an order striking a club off the register, the clerk of the Court, if he is not also the clerk of the Court as above defined, shall forthwith send notice of the order to the clerk of that Court.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 22, line 28, at the end, to inser the words '(2) Section twenty-eight of the Licensing Act, 1902, shall be read as if any grounds for notice of objection to the registration or renewal of registration of a club under this Act, which are not mentioned in that section, were added thereto as grounds on which a club may be struck off the register.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 291; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 408.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt HnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies,David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,Sir W.Howell(Bristol,S
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W

Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E.
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, RtHn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur

Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm'gham
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis (Antrim,S
Craig,Captain James (Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, JamesFitzalan(Sheffield)
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt.Hon.SirJohn H.
Keswick, William
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.(Stanley(York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 22, line 33, to leave out the first word 'Any,' and to insert the word 'The.'"

"In page 29, line 11, after the word 'holder,' to insert the words 'to a person from whom he is bound by any covenant, agreement, or undertaking, or is otherwise under any direct or indirect obligation of any kind to obtain a supply of intoxicating liquor.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In Schedule 5, page 33, line 31, to leave out the words 'of Inland Revenue,' and to insert the words 'for the time being having the management of the duties of excise.'"—(*Sir S. Evans.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 287 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 409.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Hotatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J. F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh
Brunner,RtHn Sir J.T.(Ches're
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig,Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,SirW.Howell (Bristol,S.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE. Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)

OLD-AGE PENSIONS (REGULATIONS).

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) moved: "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying him to annul so much of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, 1908, as provides that the pension officers shall, in investigating the claims of applicants, be subject to any further instructions issued for the guidance of pension officers by the Board of Inland Revenue." He apologised for having to bring the matter before the House at a very inconvenient hour, but that was the only time available for the discussion of the matter. The question arose under Regulation 9 and Regulation 34. Regulation 9 was—

> "Subject to compliance with instructions set out in the Second Schedule of these regulations and to any further instructions issued for the guidance of pension officers, the pension officer shall investigate a claim in such manner as he thinks best for the purpose."

Regulation 34 was—

> "Subject to the provisions of the Act and these regulations every person appointed as a pension officer shall, in the execution of his office, observe and follow the instructions and directions of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue."

The House would see that the pension officer was subject, in addition to the statutory rules and regulations, to instructions to be issued by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue; in other words, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, so far as the pension officers were concerned, determined the manner in which the Old-Age Pension Act was to be administered, and how the vast sums under that Act were to be paid away. Practically, the pension officer was the person who determined the greater part of the matters arising under the Act. There were, he thought, only thirteen pension committees to deal with the whole of London. It was quite impossible for them to give any real consideration to the question of granting or withholding a pension. The reports of the pension officers were presented to these committees, and in a vast number of cases they were passed practically without any discusson. He could give the House an instance of a particular pension committee. In two hours they dealt with over 250 separate applications. It was quite plain, however able the gentlemen forming the committee might be, that they could give no real attention to the matter in two hours, and, as a matter of fact, all the cases in which the pension officers reported in favour of a 5s. pension were passed without any consideration at all. They were not even examined by the pension committee. That accounted for 200 cases. The other fifty in which smaller pensions were recommended were given some consideration, but it was physically impossible for the committee to examine with any care any more than six or eight; and in only one case did they make any serious criticism of what the pension officer had done. All the cases in which the pension officers did not think it desirable to report in favour of a pension never came before the Committee at all. He did not say a word against the pension officer; generally speaking and as far as his experience went, he was an admirable officer, but he and he alone was the administrative judge under the Act. The officers might do their best; but they were working at the very highest pressure now, many of them working fifteen and more hours a day, and their consideration of the matter was, he would not say perfunctory, but necessarily brief. Their guide in the whole matter was the instructions issued by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. They were bound to obey those instructions, and it was upon instructions which were absolutely secret from the House that £6,000,000 or £8,000,000 of public money a year were being expended. The Government had been asked and had refused to lay those instructions before the House. If the financial control of the House was to be anything more than a mere name, it ought to know what instructions the Commissioners of Inland Revenue — that was to say the Chancellor of the Exchequer—were giving to the pension officers, who practically had the whole administration of this vast sum of £6,000,000 or £8,000,000 a year. He did not propose to detain the House at any length at that hour, but he ventured to think it was a matter which deserved the attention of the House of Commons. It was quite obvious that the gravest abuses might easily arise under a system of expenditure of public money of that description. He did not propose to go at any length into the case mentioned by the hon. Member for Preston at an earlier period of the session, but it illustrated in a comparatively minor degree the thing which had happened on one side of the administration and which might happen on the other. The case which was probably well-known, was under one of the instructions published in the newspapers. The pension officers had been directed not to take into consideration the furniture of the applicant up to £30 in estimating a man's means. He did not wish to say that that was not a perfectly proper provision. He thought it was a perfectly reasonable thing in itself, but it was not part of the Act of Parliament. Anyone who looked at Section 4 of the Act would see that everything the applicant had had to be taken into consideration in estimating his means. Under subsection (*d*) everything which the applicant personally used or enjoyed had to be taken into consideration. So strict was the Act of Parliament that every advantage which an applicant got for living in a house below its full rack rent had to be taken into consideration, although the fact that he possessed £30 worth of furniture would not be taken into account under the instruction which had been given. If an applicant had any gifts of clothing, or food, however small or minute, they would be taken into consideration, but the question of the possession of this furniture would not be taken into account. Some hon. Members might imagine they were objecting to this instruction, but that was not so. What they were objecting to was the Chancellor of the Exchequer taking upon himself the making of Amendments in a statute which had received the assent of both Houses of Parliament. He would illustrate what a tremendous constitutional innovation such a procedure as that was. Supposing after this Bill had passed the House of Commons and had gone up to the House of Lords their Lordships had inserted an Amendment to the effect that in estimating the means of the applicant no account should be taken of furniture up to the value of £30. He had no doubt Mr. Speaker would have considered that an infringement of the privileges of the House of Commons, because it would have involved an additional payment by the taxpayers; and yet that could be done by the Chancellor of the Exchequer without any infringement of their privileges at all. If that was to be allowed an immense power was being placed in the hands of the Government, because that was by no means the only blot upon the Old-Age Pensions Act. There were many other things which the Chancellor of the Exchequer might, with much greater fairness, have taken upon himself to amend in the Act. There was, for example, the ridiculous provision that if a man was taken into an infirmary for a few days—it might be in consequence of an accident in the street or a sudden attack of illness—he was absolutely disqualified for a pension. That was a gross injustice which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not amended, although if he had done so he would not have infringed the law any more than he had already done by the issuing of this instruction. It was clear that the right hon. Gentleman could amend it in other ways by imposing new conditions directing pension officers to make most elaborate inquiries into a man's character. Hon. Members would remember the provision dealing with the test of character. It was of the utmost importance how that was considered, and it entirely depended upon the instruction sent to the pension officer. They might be told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that their objections were ridiculous, and that the question of the furniture was not worth while considering, but he did not agree with that argument. This was a very important constitutional question, for if the House of Commons was to allow a Minister of the day to make Amendments and alterations in Acts of Parliament, another blow would be struck at the prestige and constitutional position of the House. The fact that the actual change had been made was in itself a small matter, but they had to consider the principle. First of all, there was the principle at stake that no change should be made in an Act of Parliament by the executive Government except by another Act of Parliament, and in the second place there was the more serious principle involved that the administration of a vast sum of money, amounting to something between £6,000,000 and £8,000,000, ought not to depend upon secret instructions given by the Minister of the day. It was for that reason that he ventured to move his Motion, and he desired to ascertain the feeling of the House upon this very serious constitutional principle.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that in a very few words he would second the Amendment of his noble friend. The case for this Motion had been put so clearly that the point at issue must be apparent to the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite. There could be no doubt that this was a matter of grave and serious importance to the House of Commons. The question was whether the House of Commons was prepared to allow the administration of one of its own Acts of Parliament to lie in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or any other Minister acting outside the control of the House of Commons, behind its back, secretly, in the dark, in a way that neither the House of Commons nor the country could understand. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] He was not astonished that some hon. Members opposite, by their laughter, seemed to doubt the exact accuracy of the description he had given. He did not know whether any of them were aware that in this case they were dealing with instructions having the force of a statute, and those instructions affected the administration of vast sums of public money. Those instructions were absolutely secret, and nobody outside the Treasury bench had any means of knowing what they were. Under those circumstances he submitted that this was a matter which vitally concerned the House as a whole, and he should await with great interest the answer made on behalf of the Government. He confessed that he thought it would be a little difficult, unless there was something which had entirely escaped his notice, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to satisfy the House. They might be told that, under this regulation, the pension officer had to act under the secret instructions of the right hon. Gentleman, and that he was subject to the provisions of the Act. That was true, but what was the result of it? It was that they were putting every pension officer in the country in what he conceived to be a cruel and impossible position. They were putting pension officers under two direct authorities, namely, the authority of the Act of Parliament and the authority of the regulations issued by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Every pension officer would have to choose whether he would obey the direct instructions of both Houses of Parliament contained in the Act, or the contradictory instructions given in secret by the right hon. Gentleman. That was a position in which the House ought not to place any public officer, and it was a position which the House of Commons, not the Chancellor of the Exchequer or any other Minister on the Treasury bench, ought to take up. He regarded this as a matter of very great seriousness, and he thought they were under a debt of gratitude to his noble friend for having raised the question, even at such a late hour. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying him to annul so much of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, 1908, as provides that the pension officers shall, in investigating the claims of applicants, be subject to any further instructions issued for the guidance of pension officers by the Board of Inland Revenue."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The noble Lord who moved this Motion has made a very ingenious speech, but my complaint is that it has nothing to do with this Motion. He has challenged certain secret instructions issued by the Department and complains that they have not been published, but that is not the Motion. The hon. Member who seconded this Motion complained that some of those instructions were *ultra vires*. That is not the Motion submitted to the House. Will the House just look for a moment at the Motion, to which the noble Lord never referred, and which he never supported by a single argument in his speech. The Motion is "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying him to annul so much of the Old-Age Pensions Regulations, 1908, as provides that the pension officers shall, in investigating the claims of applicants, be subject to any further instructions issued for the guidance of pension officers by the Board of Inland Revenue." Really, what is the complaint of the noble Lord? He submits to the House of Commons the statement that one instruction out of 150 or 160, which very improperly has appeared in the newspapers, is, according to his notion, *ultra vires*, and because of that the Department is never to give any instructions at all to any officer under any conditions, and a humble Address is to be presented to His Majesty, and the House is invited to say that these officers for ever shall act without any instructions at all. Whom are they to obey?

LORD R. CECIL: The statute.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The officers have to be under the direction of somebody even in administering the statute. They are officers of the Inland Revenue, and if this Motion is adopted the Inland Revenue cannot give them instructions.

MR. BOWLES: Not secret instructions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Really I think the hon. Member who has taken the trouble to second the Motion cannot have read it. There is not a word in this Motion about secret instructions. The House is invited to appeal to His Majesty to declare that these officers should not be instructed at all as to the way they are to administer the Act. I think it is one of the most preposterous Motions ever submitted to the House of Commons. If the noble Lord wants to carry out that instruction there is a way of doing it, but if this Motion is carried the Chancellor of the Exchequer will not be responsible, nobody can give any instructions; and these officers will act on their own responsibility and will not be responsible to Parliament in the ordinary constitutional way. The noble Lord says he wants to preserve the Constitution, but he is absolutely destroying it by this Motion. The Constitution says that a Minister shall be responsible for an officer who is carrying out an Act of Parliament under his general control. If that Minister is directed not to give any instructions at all, and if the officer is to act upon his own initiative without any reference to the Minister, how is the Minister to be responsible to Parliament for the administration of the Act? I do not think the noble Lord can have thought out this Motion when he put it down, because he is simply trying by a very indirect and irrelevant method to raise a matter which is not within the four corners of the Motion. The noble Lord wishes to challenge the interpretation placed by the Inland Revenue upon an Act of Parliament, but that is not his Motion. I may remind him that there is a method by which he can do this, and that is upon the Estimates. The noble Lord asks me to follow constitutional methods, but I have pointed out to him the time-honoured constitutional method of challenging the act of a Minister. It is the only way you can do it.

LORD R. CECIL: I can challenge it upon this Motion.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The noble Lord cannot challenge my interpretation of an Act of Parliament by a Motion that has absolutely nothing to do with it. His Motion is that no further instructions be issued at all to any officer under that Act of Parliament. I am quite willing to defend the instruction complained of, because I think it is a proper, reasonable, and sensible instruction, and the only practical interpretation to place upon the Act of Parliament. It would have been perfectly absurd to place an interpretation upon the Act which would have involved the pension officer valuing not merely the furniture in a man's house but also the clothes which he wears.

LORD R. CECIL: But he has to do that.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg the noble Lord's pardon; that is not so, and he cannot have read the instructions. This, however, is not the time to discuss the instructions. I wish to save the Excise officers the very unnecessary trouble of going through the form of valuing every little article of clothing and furniture in a poor household—and to save them, too, at the present moment, when they are strained up to breaking point by the labours cast upon them. We wish also to save the people themselves from this very unnecessary annoyance of having to submit an account of every yard of clothing they have got and place a valuation upon it. To give a general instruction against that kind of thing is a sensible and rational course to follow. That is my defence. I am prepared to defend my action at the proper moment when the noble Lord has devoted a little more time to studying the Constitution. Until the noble Lord takes the real constitutional method of challenging my action, I ask the House to reject this really very foolish and preposterous Motion.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston) said the right hon. Gentleman must have known that the remedy which he suggested was a purely futile remedy, because there would be no Estimates before the House for another three or four months. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer said his instruction was a right instruction, why was it not put into the Statutory Regulations? There were many points in those regulations as minute as this, and there was no reason why it should not have been put in. There was a great deal to be said for this limitation but it ought to have been in the Act. His right hon. friend was a lawyer and had distinguished himself in so many ways lately that they sometimes forgot that fact. Would the right hon. Gentleman stand up and say that this was a legal interpretation of the Act of Parliament? The pension officer in making the valuation was to ignore furniture and certain other things, but really if he was to make a proper valuation he must take these things into account. But that was not the point at issue. He was not prepared to argue whether it was a wise or a foolish rule. He thought there was a good deal to be said for it. Might he point out that no limitation was made with regard to food and clothing? He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a little out of the facts in regard to his own instruction. It applied to furniture, but not to clothing. Clothing was to be valued to the last stitch. Food was also to be valued. His point was that when the Old-Age Pensions Act was passing through the House they ought to have had an opportunity of discussing these questions, and they ought to have been allowed to decide under what conditions pensions should be given. They were not allowed to do so, but after the Bill had become an Act the Chancellor of the Exchequer on his own authority took upon himself to alter the words of the Act, and what was more, he took upon himself as a Minister of the Crown to do what the House of Commons had always resented being done by the Crown, namely, to impose a charge on the taxpayer. He thought the noble Lord was perfectly justified in using any form which the rules of the House permitted to bring to the notice of the House this gross breach of the English Constitution.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a verbal excuse rather than an answer worthy of the occasion. What the Chancellor of the Exchequer suggested was that if this Resolution were carried, no instructions would be available for the guidance of the pension officers. The Regulations were there. What his noble friend said was that further secret instructions, in addition to the Regulations, should not be issued. These instructions they had every reason to suppose—in fact they knew—were *ultra vires*, inasmuch as they imposed an additional charge on the people. That was the real issue. What they asked was whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would defend his instructions, which he had assured the House were good and sensible and proper, by laying them on the Table of the House, and whether he was prepared to defend himself against the allegation that he had made a charge upon the people.

Mr. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said he understood from the reply to a Question that before the Regulations became operative the House would be afforded an opportunity to discuss them. He should like to know from the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether there would be an opportunity to discuss the printed Regulations. He was not referring to the secret instructions to officers.

He did not think it was fair to say that this matter could be discussed on the Estimates, because that would practically mean arraigning the right hon. Gentleman on a vote of censure.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the disposition of the time of the House was a matter for the Prime Minister, and the hon. Member must address a Question to his right hon. friend on the subject.

Mr. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury), in supporting the Motion, asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would lay the instructions on the Table. What they complained of was that the right hon. Gentleman had issued certain instructions privately to the Inland Revenue officers in addition to the regulations which had been published. A summary of these instructions had appeared in one of the newspapers, and some of them undoubtedly did impose a charge on the taxpayers If the charge had been imposed by the other House, Mr. Speaker would have ruled that it was a breach of privilege, and he would have been supported.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Are we to understand that the Chancellor of the Exchequer declines to lay these instructions on the Table?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the instructions had been published in a newspaper. What he was informed was, and other Government Departments took the same view, that it was extremely undesirable that instructions of that kind should be published. He would ask the hon. and learned Member whether he would accept the responsibility of advising any Government Department to start as a precedent the publication of instructions, given to its own officers. It would, he thought, be almost impossible to stop at that. Instructions given to Revenue officers with regard to the method of collecting the revenue, instructions with regard to breweries, distilleries, and income-tax, instructions given by the Home Office to the police, or to its own officers by the Board of Trade, would all have to be published if once the precedent were established. That would be most inadvisable, and he must ask the hon. and learned Member to consider very seriously the stand he had taken in that matter. It was not a matter which affected the present Government only, but one which would affect all Governments once the precedent was established, and he must appeal to the House not to establish that precedent.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY said he desired to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that the instructions were so important that they ought to have been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said there appeared to be some confusion as to the instructions. Those which the noble Lord had referred to had been confused with others. Instructions 92 had legal authority, but Instructions 34 were purely ordinary instructions given by the Department.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY said the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that there was great danger in establishing a precedent, but the right hon, Gentleman had himself established a precedent in those regulations, for he had issued instructions which were a schedule addition to an Act of Parliament, and which had been issued in an unconstitutional manner. That was the charge they had to make against the right hon. Gentleman, and that charge was not to be got rid of by the most improper levity with which the right hon. Gentleman had answered it. The right hon. Gentleman's answer had been a long string of words in which the word preposterous had been used at least three times, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the use of language such as that had at times recoiled on those who used it with most damaging effect.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 54; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 410.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingto)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Pee
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Bowles.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isleof Wight
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A Cecil.
Bennet, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Carr-Gomm, W. H.
Causton,RtHn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frderick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Crae, Sir George
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Middlebrook, William
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray,Capt.HnA.C.(Kincard.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps,Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Sir CharlesEdw.(Stafford
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walters, John Tudor
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White,J.Dundas(Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 20th November, 1908.

The Earl Carrington chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners.

LICENSING BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Wednesday next; The Lord Privy Seal (*E. Crewe.*) (No. 229.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 20th November, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Perth Corporation," presented by Mr. Sinclair; read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Act) to be read a second time upon Monday, 30th November, and to be printed. [Bill 377.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP M).

Sir LUKE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group M of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

LICENSED PREMISES (EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN).

Petitions for legislation: From Bolton; Newcastle-upon-Tyne (two); North Warwickshire; Oldbury; Rhondda Valley; Stockton-on-Tees; Swindon; Wallsend; and Waveney Valley; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Forfarshire; and Gateshead; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL

Petition from Forfarshire, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Duffus, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SUNDAY CLOSING (SHOPS) BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary for Scotland, providing for the Early Closing of certain classes of shops in the burgh of Hamilton [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Investments in Consols.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has any information as to the number of holders of French Rentes and of British Consols respectively; and whether he will appoint a small Committee to consider the alterations that might be made in the present system of subscribing to, transferring, and registering Consols with a view to increasing their popularity with the small investor, and thereby securing a more steady and more open market, thus improving the credit of the country.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I do not possess the information in regard to the number of holders of French Rentes which would enable me to make the comparison asked for by my hon. friend; but I am willing to take steps to procure these particulars, if he would wish me to do so. I am aware that there has been some discussion as to the superior merits of the French system for the purpose which my hon. friend has in view; but, as at present advised, I do not propose to appoint a Committee.

Assistance to Scottish Pension Officers.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Excise officers at present engaged in pension work in England and Ireland are receiving assistance from the Board of Inland Revenue; and whether such assistance has been given to officers in in Scotland who are engaged upon the same work under similar circumstances; and, if not, whether this will be put right.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Additional assistance, where required, has been given to pension officers in Scotland as well as in England and Ireland.

Superannuation of Civil Servants.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is prepared to make a statement as to when he will introduce the promised legislation respecting the superannuation of civil servants, as indicated in the letter from the Treasury to the Civil Servants Deferred Pay Committee on 4th February.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I hope that the Bill may be introduced next Session.

National Debt—Assets of a definite Cash Value.

MR. WEDGWOOD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what proportion of the National Debt is represented by valuable assets, such as buildings, lands, docks, telegraphs, etc.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I beg to refer my hon. friend to the statement given on page 94 of the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom, which shows the assets of a definite cash value. No estimate has been made of the value of the rest.

Amount Unissued of Unemployed Grant.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that the only sum now available for expenditure up to 31st March next as a contribution in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, for the relief of unemployment is the difference between the amount so expended since 31st March last and £200,000, he can state what the difference now is.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The amount still unissued out of the £200,000 already voted is £116,000.

Old-Age Pensions—Voluntary Contributions.

MR. FINDLAY: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the pension officer is entitled to call for a signed document stating the amount of voluntary contribution the members of a family, all married and in homes of their own, are making towards the support of their father and mother who have no means within the meaning of the Act; and whether it is the intention of the Government to exclude old people over seventy from the benefits of the old-age pension scheme where the members of their family are doing what they can to make them comfortable.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is necessary that the pension officer should obtain the information referred to in the Question to enable him to discharge his statutory duties of reporting to the pension committee. I am not aware that there is any warrant for the suggestion that such means are not means within the meaning of the Act. It is not the intention of the Government to exclude from the benefits of the scheme any persons receiving assistance from members of their families who would be included if in the enjoyment of an equal income as the result of their own present or past exertions.

Dismissal of Postman D. O'Connell, of Derinagree.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the summary dismissal of a postman named Daniel O'Connell, in the Derinagree postal district, near Mallow, County Cork, after two days notice and without any assigned cause; whether one postman, a young man recently appointed, is required to do duty previously done by two postmen; and whether, in view of the fact that there has not been any complaint against O'Connell in the discharge of his duty, that he has been for nine years in the postal service and is a married man with a large family, his case will be reconsidered with a view to his reinstatement, or, failing that, adequate compensation will be awarded him.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Two small duties have recently been amalgamated into one with a view to improving the postal service in the district. This rendered it necessary to dispense with the services of O'Connell, who was employed on a duty which occupied about two hours a day, and for which 5s. a week was paid. Unfortunately there was no other auxiliary duty which could be given him. Endeavour is being made to obtain a small grant for him from a Post Office charitable fund.

Black Scab Potato Disease in England.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose, Burghs): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, in what counties in England and Scotland the black scab potato disease is known to exist; what steps have been taken by the Board, since the order of 18th June last making the disease a notifiable one, for the purpose either of lessening the area of infection or of checking its spread.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The wart disease of potatoes is known to exist in the following counties of England and Scotland: Berkshire, Cheshire, Cumberland, Derbyshire, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Salop, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Yorkshire, Ayr, Clackmannan, Dumfries, Dumbarton, Fife, Perth, Stirling. The Board have sent their leaflet on the disease to those concerned. The leaflet explains the causes of infection and the preventive and remedial measures to be adopted. Their inspectors have also visited the affected districts, and have taken all possible steps to bring to the notice of growers the nature of the disease, and warned them of the results of neglecting the remedial and preventive measures recommended by the Board.

Bristol University Charter.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the Charter of the University of Bristol will be laid, and when it can become operative.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The draft Charter was laid before Parliament last Tuesday. As regards the latter part of the Question I can only say that the Charter must lie upon the Table for thirty days before it can be submitted to His Majesty.

Postal Officials—Time Spent in Travelling.

SIR GEORGE McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is a rule of the Post Office that time spent in travelling on its service is reckoned as duty; whether a number of officers on the Edinburgh telegraph staff returning to headquarters on various Sundays after season duty at Lerwick have received payment for the time so occupied; and, if not, whether in future officers shall not be required to travel in their own time on Post Office service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is not the practice, except in certain cases, to reckon time spent in travelling as duty. I am not aware of more than one case in which members of the Edinburgh telegraph staff applied for payment for time spent in returning to headquarters from Lerwick on Sundays, and in that instance the claim was refused. The two officers in question received the usual subsistence allowance covering the time spent in travelling

Travelling Expenses of Scottish Department Officials.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he would state the total sums during the years 1906 and 1907 incurred as travelling expenses between England and Scotland by the officers of the Scottish Education Department, differentiating between those employed in London and those employed in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The total sums incurred as travelling expenses between England and Scotland in 1906 and 1907 by officers of the Scottch Education Department were as follows:—

	1906.			1907.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By Officers employed in London - - -	69	15	5	116	12	8
" " Scotland - - -	104	4	0	114	3	9

Provision of Meals for School Children.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the names of the local authorities that have received the sanction of his Board to levy a rate for the feeding of school children under the provision of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Local education authorities authorised by the Board of Education to spend money out of the rates on the provision of food under Section 3 of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, 1906: Aston Manor Urban District, Acton Urban District, Ashton-under-Lyne Borough, Bath County Borough, Barry Urban District, Birkenhead County Borough, Birmingham County Borough, Bootle County Borough, Bradford County Borough, Brighouse Borough, Brighton County Borough, Bristol County Borough, Bury St. Edmunds Borough, Bolton County Borough, Bury County Borough, Burslem Borough, Cannock Urban District, Cardiff County Borough, Coventry County Borough, Crewe Borough, Chadderton Urban District, Cumberland County Council, Dukinfield Borough, Durham County Council, Darwen Borough, Ebbw Vale Urban District, Erith Urban District, Farnworth Urban District, Gillingham Borough, Gorton Urban District, Halifax County Borough, Hartlepool Borough, Hastings County Borough, Hebburn Urban District, Heywood Borough, Huddersfield County Borough, Hyde Borough, Keighley Borough, Kent County Council, Kingston-upon-Hull County Borough King's Norton and Northfield Urban District, Leyton Urban District, Manchester County Borough, Middlesbrough County Borough, Middleton Borough, Mountain Ash Urban District, Nelson Borough, Newcastle-upon Tyne County Borough, Newport County Borough (Mon.), Norwich County Borough, Nottingham County Borough, Rotherham County Borough, St. Helen's County Borough, Salford County Borough, Sheffield County Borough, South Shields County Borough, Stalybridge Borough, Stockton-upon-Tees Borough, Stretford Urban District, Swansea County Borough, Swindon Borough, Swinton and Pendlebury Urban District, Tottenham Urban District, Wallasey Urban District, Walthamstow Urban District, Wallsend Borough, West Ham County Borough, Workington Borough, York County Borough, Yorks West Riding County Council.

Clergy and Income-Tax.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state if income-tax is charged on the incomes of clergymen of all denominations, Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, at the same rate; and can he state the total amount received from this source from Ireland during 1907–8 from Protestant and Roman Catholic clergymen, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) In common with all other taxpayers, clergy of all denominations who are in receipt of incomes exceeding the exemption limit, are chargeable with income-tax at the rate in force for the time being. I am unable to give the information for which the hon. Member asks in the second part of the Question.

Restoration of Edward M'Brien, of Derrygonnelly.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for restoration from Edward M'Brien, of Derrygonnelly, County Fermanagh, as son of an evicted tenant on the Ely estate; and will the Commissioners provide him with a holding under the powers of the Act or under Section 2 of the Purchase Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the receipt of any application for reinstatement from Edward M'Brien.

Redistribution of the Baslichane Farm.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with reference to the proposed redistribution of the Baslichane farm on the Butler estate, Waterville, County Kerry, by the Congested Districts Board, all the applications made by those interested have been inquired into and considered.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board have considered all applications from tenants on the Butler and Hartopp estates now in the Board's possession, for land on the Baslichane farm, and have made arrangements for the disposal of the greater part of the farm to their tenants on these adjoining estates. No applications from tenants or sons of tenants on estates not purchased by the Board have been entertained, because the land available for distribution is not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Board's own tenants.

Closing of Carryduff National School.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the reasons which have prompted the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland to close Carryduff National School, County Down, the average attendance at which is twenty-six.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Federation have ordered that grants be withdrawn from Carryduff National School on the retirement of the present teacher, which takes place on 31st December next, in view of the large number of small schools in the locality.

Payment of Grant to Irish Junior Assistant School-Mistresses.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that junior assistant mistresses in Irish national schools have not yet been paid their share of the £114,000 grant, although principal teachers received payment on 24th October last; and can he state the reason of the delay and on what date payment will be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, in order to be eligible for the grant, junior assistant teachers must have at least two years service and must be efficient. Payment has been made in every case in which the Commissioners have been satisfied on these two points. The investigation of doubtful cases is proceeding.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Mr. Austin Taylor; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Sinclair.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) (No. 2) BILL.

"To make further provision with respect to Elementary Education in England and Wales," presented by Mr. Runciman; supported by the Prime Minister, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Attorney-General, and Mr. Trevelyan; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 376.]

LICENSING BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): It is as far back as the month of February last that I introduced this Bill to the House, and, from that time to this, despite the distractions of a number of other topics of competing interest, it may fairly be said that it has excited, in a very unusual degree, attention and controversy both in Parliament and in the country. This House has not been sparing of itself in discussing both its principles and its details. When the Third Reading takes place, as I hope it will, at the conclusion of our sitting this afternoon, we shall have expended upon it no fewer than six full weeks of Parliamentary time. And I cannot let slip this opportunity of paying, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues in the Government, a tribute of most sincere gratitude and admiration for the conspicuous and unfailing ability with which, in all its stages, and particularly during the Committee and Report stages, its provisions have been expounded and defended by my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General, and by my right hon. friend the Under-Secretary for the Home Office. I am sure that is an acknowledgement in which the whole House will be ready to join. In these circumstances, if the conditions were normal, I should have been disposed to content myself to-day with simply congratulating the House upon approaching the completion of a long and difficult task. But the circumstances in regard to this measure are not normal. There is no Bill of our time, no Bill certainly, of which I have memory, which has been the subject, at any rate outside the walls of Parliament, of greater misunderstanding, and, I must add, of more deliberate misconstruction. It has been denounced, on the one hand, as an act of spoliation, ostensibly directed against a single trade, but involving principles which, if they came to be universally or even generally applied, would strike a fatal blow at the very foundations of property itself. It has been, on the other hand, from the temperance point of view, scoffed at and derided as at once futile and hypocritical—I thought there would have been a cheer from hon. Gentlemen opposite—as inspired, not by any genuine desire to diminish the facilities for intemperance or to curtail the area of misery and crime, but simply by vindictive hostility to a particular trade which is supposed to be out of favour with the Government and with the majority in this House. I think it is right, therefore, as this may be the last occasion when it will be possible to say anything by way of general review, that I should endeavour, in a very few, but I hope plain and intelligible words, to describe before we part with the Bill what it is that it proposes and what it is that it does not propose.

Now, Sir, the first object of this measure, as I stated when I introduced it, is to get rid by a compulsory, and, so far as local conditions will admit, by a uniform process, and within a reasonable distance of time, of the redundant licences which at present exist. Is it disputed in any quarter of the House that there is a present excess in the number of licences as compared with the reasonable requirements of the community? If it is disputed I can only say it was affirmed ten years ago by the Peel Commission, and what was true then is at least equally true at the present day.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) Will the right hon. Gentleman excuse me? Not equally true—there has been a substantial reduction.

MR. ASQUITH: That is quite true. But I was not speaking of figures, I was speaking of the fact of excess in the facilities for the consumption of drink as compared with the real needs of the population, and I say that that phenomenon is as striking to-day as it has ever been. If that be so, and if, as we think, the process of undoubted acceleration in the reduction of the number of licences, which is one of the results of the Act of 1904, is a process which still falls lamentably short, in its magnitude and in its speed, of the real necessities of the case, can any one suggest a better, a more sensible, or a more equitable way of dealing wth the problem than that which has been adopted in this Bill?

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): Yes.

MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Gentleman says "Yes." Well, he has not yet presented his alternative scheme.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): That is not our business.

MR. ASQUITH: I am challenging criticism, and I say that if you start as we did, with the assumption that there is an excess in the number of licences, and that excess ought to be reduced, not sporadically nor capriciously, not casually, not merely in accordance with the wishes or desires of this or that bench of magistrates, but ought to be reduced uniformly on principles which are applicable in the main to the country as a whole, how could you do better than take, as we have taken, into account the density of population, and, having made full allowance for the special conditions of particular localities, then provide that within a not very short period of time, but within fourteen years, there shall be brought about a reduction which we estimate at something like one-third of the total number of existing licences? That is the first clause of this Bill as modified and explained by the first Schedule; and I venture to affirm that if that clause stood alone, if there was nothing else in the measure, it is one which this House or any other Legislature in this country would take great responsibility in refusing to pass.

I pass from that, which is our first object, to another and one which we regard as of equal importance. In the interests of the community we desire by this legislation to pave the way effectually by which to arrive at a state of things when the State will have an unfettered discretion as regards the conditions imposed and will have uncontrolled dominion as regards all property conferred in the shape of all licences, whether old or new. We are helped very much in maintaining that proposition by the precedent set us in the Act of 1904. The authors of that Act are estopped by their own legislation from denying that, whenever a person comes forward and asks from the community that he shall be granted the exclusive privilege, even if only for a year, of selling without competition or with only restricted competition, this particular form of commodity, then it is the right of the State, acting through the licensing authority, to impose any conditions it sees fit as regards the conduct of the business; and it is the duty of the State, not merely its right, to demand as an equivalent for the privilege which it has conferred on him the whole of what is called in that Act the monopoly value. So that, as regards future licences, it is common ground between all parties that the community has this right which we want to regain as regards all licences. What is the ideal by which, always having regard —and I shall endeavour to show that we have always had the most scrupulous regard—for existing interests—what is the ideal which, in order to provide for that, you ought to seek to maintain? In the first place, it is that the voice of the community shall have the right to make itself heard, and effectively heard, as regards the number and even the existence of licences as far as that community is concerned, and naturally that the added value given to the premises of a trade by the possession of a licence, or in other words by a State-conferred monopoly, that added value —which, be it remembered, is a bonus over and above the profits on capital and the reward of the skill and industry which an ordinary trader finds a sufficient inducement to persuade him to embark upon a commercial venture— that that added bonus may be resumed or acquired by the State. That is the second object we have in promoting this legislation.

I want now to come to another part of the subject upon which more honest misapprehension exists. I want to examine for a few moments how these two results—the reduction of redundant licences within a certain time, and the acquisition by the State of the monopoly value of all licences at the end of that period—can be brought about. As I said, I think, when I introduced the Bill, and as both I and my colleagues have said on subsequent occasions, there is no necessary logical connection between the length of the reduction period during which redundant licences come to an end and what is technically called the time-limit, or the time at the expiration of which the State is to enter into possession of the monopoly value. In our original proposals they were separate; but I have been careful to point out that it is not due to any logical or political necessities, and that that matter was freely open to argument, and that we should keep our minds open to it throughout our discussions. The House knows that we have now a different length of time. Although the length of time in the two cases need not necessarily correspond, yet the manner in which you are going to deal with them depends, in both cases, as regards both the length of time and the money to be paid, upon what is the true view of the nature of the interest conferred by a licence. I am almost ashamed at this time of day to enter once more upon that inquiry, but it is necessary to do so, even though it be for the last time. One thing is perfectly plain. If a licence granted to retail intoxicating liquor, in respect of the premises upon which that liquor is to be sold, confers upon the licence-holder an interest analogous to the interest acquired by a man who buys a house or an acre of land in the open market, then we know precisely where we are. He is to all intents and purposes a freeholder; in other words, he has an indefeasible title to the perpetual enjoyment of the interest which he has acquired. If that is so, in accordance with all precedent and principle, the State cannot take away that which he has honestly acquired without paying him compensation, and compensation out of public funds. That is an elementary proposition which I hope will not be denied in any quarter of this House. But is such an interest conferred by a licence? It is often so described in the country; but we know what has been said about it in this House in this very week. It is absolutely impossible for anybody responsible, either as authors or supporters of the Act of 1904, to contend that the interest conferred by a licence is in any sense a freehold. If it were, the provisions of that Act were monstrously unfair, because you were taking away, or allowing the justices to take away, from those persons property not by reason of any misconduct of their own, not because they failed to comply with the conditions, expressed or implied, upon which it had been granted, but solely because in the interests of the community it was desirable to do so. If that was so, the only proper and honest way in which to deal with it was to pay compensation out of public funds—to make the community pay. They did not do so. We have never yet had an answer to the simple inquiry why, if the contentions now put forward in regard to the nature and equity of the licence-holders' interests are correctly founded, was the compensation made payable under the Licensing Act of 1904 not by the community, but by the trade?

Now if interest conferred by a licence is not a freehold, what is it? In point of law it is not, and never has been or can be until the law is altered, anything but a precarious interest, granted for a year, revocable at the end of the year, and not only revocable, but coming to an end for the year. That is the common law and the statute law. But at the same time I have always agreed that there had grown up above and around that bare legal conception the excrescence of practice, which had created expectations—expectations so constantly realised that many people had ceased to regard them as mere expectations at all; and in accordance with the rules of equity which govern legislation in this country it would not be fair, or in accordance with precedent, to deal with them according to the principles of abstract law. Those expectations, as I pointed out, were of two kinds, the expectation of renewal and of freedom—limited freedom, at any rate—from competition. But the magistrates might, when the licensing day came round, refuse to renew a licence without reason assigned, and might, as the Liverpool bench did, by multiplying licences destroy the monopoly. It is necessary to recall these things when these exaggerated and fictitious conceptions of the value of licences are put forward. That being so, what is the fair way and the only fair way to deal with the matter if you are going, in the public interest, either to reduce the number of licences upon a large scale by compulsory methods or to resume for the State the monopoly value of the licences? We have said that there is only one way, and that is by a time notice with a payment in the one case of compensation, and in the other case of fair allowance for the monopoly value. This is the point to which I wish to bring the controversy, if I can, between the supporters and the opponents of this Bill. I am not speaking now of the length of the time. That is a perfectly arguable point. It always has been, and always will be, and is one on which we cannot expect to get unanimity. But I wish to ask those who are going to invite the House to reject the Bill on the Third Reading whether they do or do not accept the principle of a time-limit at all. I think that is a fair question. I quite agree that if we were dealing with property to which the freehold conception applies, if we were taking railways, or land, or houses, or what not, from persons who are indefeasible owners with perpetual right of property, then I quite agree that time-limits are things which do not come in. I have said it before, and repeat it because I feel it so strongly, and it is necessary that it should be emphatically stated over and over again, that I do not think any greater disservice has been done to the real interests of property in this country than the comparison, the analogy, and the identity which the opponents of this Bill have sought to establish between the interest created by a licence and a freehold interest.

MR. G. D. FABER (York): What about the Socialists?

MR. ASQUITH: They can speak for themselves. I am not a Socialist. If you are not dealing with freehold property, a time-limit is the only way of disposing of that kind of interest, which, in point of law, is very slender, but in point of practice is magnified by this excrescence of expectation. That is the only fair and equitable way of dealing with that kind of interest which statesmen in this country can devise. How do we propose to apply that principle? We are travelling over very familiar ground, and I must apologise to the House. What will be the state of things under this Bill if it passes into law in its present shape? The hon. Gentlemen opposite seem to think this is a contingency that need hardly be discussed.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): If the right hon. Gentleman wants to know what I was thinking I will tell him. I was thinking that the Solicitor-General's hair would rise on end at the thought.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think that that observation is of much importance. We will pass from that. What will be the state of things under this Bill if by a hypothetical contingency it passes into law? First of all, in the fourteen years which have been described as the reduction period the redundant licences will be by a more or less uniform process gradually weeded out of existence, and the compensation to those who are extinguished will be provided, as it is now, by those who survive. Of course they will be compensated on the footing that they were entitled to an annuity for a term of years, but not in perpetuity, and the basis on which the compensation will be assessed will be a different one from that which the interpretation of the Act of 1904 has placed upon it.

Now come to the end of the fourteen years. What is the state of things brought about then? *Ex hypothesi* the redundant licences have disappeared, and you have got to deal with the survivors alone. With regard to them, what the Bill proposes is this. Subject to two contingencies, which I will mention, they shall have a run of seven years during which their holders will not be subject to any compensation levy, and not until the expiration of those seven years will the State be entitled to resume the monopoly value. As I said, that run is subject to two contingencies, and what are they? There are two risks undoubtedly which these surviving licence-holders will have to encounter and provide against. The first is the risk that the magistrates, the licensing authority, may still think that there is a redundancy—indeed there may be in some cases—and may further reduce below the standard of the statutory reduction that has taken place during the fourteen years. That, no doubt, is a risk, but I doubt whether it is a risk of a very serious character, because you have to consider that there has been this very large and substantial reduction in the number of licences to the extent of one-third, and simultaneously and concurrently with that you will have a very large increase in the growth of population, and presumably, unless there has been some great change in the habits and opinions of the people, there will be a larger demand for the supply of liquor. If you put these two things together, I do not think that that particular risk is one of a very serious kind. There is a further risk in which my hon. friend the Member for Appleby is more interested, and that is the risk of local option by a two-thirds majority. I do not attempt to appraise what the value of that risk will be actuarily. I do not think it is at all an unfair thing to say that, after the fourteen years is over, and after they have been established in a position of relative freedom from competition by the extinction of redundant licences, which have hitherto been their rivals—it is not an unreasonable thing to say to them: "Now you shall have a seven years run without payment of any compensation levy, subject to these two risks, against which you can insure yourselves." That is the actual situation created by this Bill; and to represent that—as it is represented in many quarters—as though it were the last stage of tyranny and confiscation does seem to me to be making too great a draft on public imagination.

Let me turn now for a moment to the other aspect of the matter, and that is the pecuniary aspect. As I said, we have altered the basis of compensation which by the interpretation put by the Kennedy judgment on the Act of 1904 has for the last three years prevailed. It is a matter which mainly concerns the trade. It concerns the trade far more than it does the public, and for these two reasons: In the first place, because we are dealing here, not with a fund derived from rates or taxation, but with a fund which has been contributed by the trade itself; and in the next place—for that does not meet the cases of individual hardship—you must never forget that this trade has got into increasingly fewer hands. The statistics on that point are most striking. There is an enormous solidarity among the ostensible licence-holders of this country. You cannot treat them as a lot of individual units, separable, independent, and standing each upon his own base.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): What about the shareholders?

MR. ASQUITH: The shareholders have nothing whatever to do with it. They have nothing whatever to do with what I am now saying. The noble Lord is not showing his usual logical acumen. I am speaking of the difference between the position of affairs in which there were 92,000 persons interested in licensed premises separately and individually in this trade and the position, which now exists, where, as we know, 90 per cent. are tied and a very large proportion of the 90,000 licence-holders are really not their own masters at all. That is why I say that this is a matter which mainly concerns the trade, and we do think that by getting rid of the rule laid down in the Kennedy judgment and by confining the assessment of compensation to the difference between the value of the premises, licensed and unlicensed, as a place for the sale and supply of retail intoxicating drink, we are not only bringing back the law more nearly to that condition in which it was intended to be by the framers of that Act, but certainly more near the requirements of common sense and justice

I now come to what is really a more important aspect of the pecuniary question, and that is the method of assessing the monopoly value, which is to be resumed by the State at the end of the time-limit. That is now defined in the twenty-sixth Clause of the Bill. What is this monopoly value? There is just as much dispute about this as about the interest created by it. Some people seem to think that, when we talk of the State resuming the monopoly value, the State is going to take possession of the premises themselves, and, if not of the premises, at any rate of the goodwill of the trader and the profits of his trade. We are not going to do anything of the kind. We have inserted in this Bill—I venture to think we have wisely inserted it—what was not explicitly stated in the Act of 1904—namely, a definition of what monopoly value is. That is a good thing.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): It is a bad definition.

MR. ASQUITH: I am sorry to hear my hon. friend say that, because I remember that on the night it was introduced into the Bill he expressed a qualified welcome.

MR. YOUNGER: That was after the right hon. Gentleman told me that he was dealing with the question from the Scottish point of view. I have since found out that the difference is essential.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not think the difference is essential at all. We are dealing now with an English Bill. My hon. friend and I are both Scottish Members, and have a natural admiration for the Scottish system, which we admit is superior to the English system, but I think I can show him that this is a perfectly just Bill according to English ideas, and according to ideas of justice. What is the monopoly value which under the clause as it now stands will be obtained, resumed, or secured—I would prefer to use the neutral word "obtained"—by the State at the end of the time-limit? It is the difference measured by the Schedule A assessment between the value of the premises—that is to say, between the rent which a tenant would give for the premises licensed and the rent which a tenant would give for the premises if they did not possess a licence. Is there any possible method simpler, fairer, or more equitable? When this matter was being discussed in Committee I got no answer to a question which I repeat now—If the Schedule A assessment is properly made, as it ought to be made, is there any element which it includes which for this purpose ought to be excluded, or any element which it excludes which for this purpose ought to be included? We have had no answer to this question, and I know of none. I believe it will be found that, always assuming that the Schedule A assessment is properly made—I make that assumption, and I think I am entitled to make it, subject to all the safeguards which the law provides—the State will not be able to take in the shape of monopoly value anything to which it is not really entitled in the strictest sense. A good deal has been said about goodwill. As regards personal goodwill, no one suggests that it enters, or can enter, into the Schedule A assessment, and, therefore, the State, by taking this difference, can compensate it. As regards local goodwill, there is an element of it which ought to be in the Schedule A assessment. If the situation of the premises—I do not mean a valuable piece of land in any particular quarter of the town or any circumstance of that kind—has led to their being resorted to in the past, if they have a special value which other premises have not, and which is derived not from the exertions of the capital, labour, industry, or skill of the tenant, but from the fact that they are where they are, this is an element which ought to be taken into consideration in the Schedule A assessment. Of course, it will be equally taken into account when, as very often occurs, the premises have a special value for any other reason not peculiar to premises which are used as licensed premises or used for the purposes of this trade. It may exist, and does exist, in the case of hundreds of other classes of property, and where the Schedule A assessment is properly made, that element must enter into consideration. I will say one word further about this. I do not want to labour the details of this matter; but whatever criticisms have been made on this simple definition of my hon. and learned friend, no alternative definition of monopoly value has yet been submitted to the House from any quarter with any confidence, which would stand five minutes criticism. A great deal of ingenuity, legal, professional, expert, and otherwise has been bestowed upon this Bill from that side of the House. I acknowledge it to the full. That serried phalanx of veterans, who are seated behind the front Opposition Bench, have grown almost grey by their constant and sedulous attendance and the vigilant watch they have kept on the proceedings of this Bill; but with all their ingenuity and industry they have not yet succeeded in finding a definition of monopoly value which will compete with that of my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General, who is entitled to say, as he did say last night, that it holds the field.

I am afraid I have detained the House too long on this part of the question. I must, before I conclude, pass to a rapid survey of the other provisions of the Bill. The parts with which I have been dealing may be described as the really contentious parts; but I should like the House to realise, and the country to realise, quite apart from all these provisions as to the resumption of monopoly value, and as to what is to happen at the end of the time-limit, what contributions this Bill really proposes to make to what ought to be the uncontroversial field. I have spoken already of the large reduction it will effect in the actual number of licences, but let me add a rather more detailed summary of the other provisions. First of all, upon the administrative side—a very important side of temperance legislation—this Bill restores to the justices their old authority. It provides—and this is a remedy of one of the great administrative abuses that exist—an appropriate and competent tribunal of appeal. It further, for the first time, makes allowance for the payment out of local funds of the costs of justices defending their decisions in the High Court. That may seem to the House a small matter, but those of us who have had practical experience of licensing litigation, like my hon. friend the Solicitor-General and in a minor degree myself, know well that the fact that the justices are obliged to defend their decisions at the cost of their own pockets often causes the gravest miscarriage of justice, and prevents the perfectly wise and proper judgment which they have given from being adequately defended or properly upheld. Now we come from administration to the substance of the law. I have spoken of the reduction in numbers. You have next the abolition of removal which is a very easy means, under the law as it at present stands, of evading the provision of the Act of 1904 with regard to new licences. You have the restriction upon the hours of Sunday opening both in London and in the country. You have the extension of the limit of the *bona fide* traveller, which was recommended, if I am not mistaken, in both the Majority and Minority Reports. The hon. Gentleman the Member for the Ayr Burghs is one of those entitled to the joint credit of the authorship of that proposal. When history comes to be written his name will always be associated with it. Then you have—and there is no provision in the Bill to which I, at any rate, attach more importance—the valuable clause with regard to children. Then we have Clause 20, which empowers the justices to impose a number of conditions in respect of specific subject-matter in regard to the renewal of licences, which they cannot impose under the Act of 1904, but which everybody who is acquainted with the real necessities of the case knows are urgently to be desired. You have provisions also which deal with the abuses of hawking drink—not the least of evils—and which make the law really stringent and effective with regard to the sale of drink on passenger vessels.

And then, lastly, there are the much discussed and much abused clauses of the Bill which deal with clubs. I believe it is still one of the most fashionable criticisms made on this Bill, and it is adduced as an irresistible proof of the hypocrisy of its authors, that, while they purport on the one hand to shut up public-houses, on the other hand they are opening the door to an indefinite multiplication of the facilities for drink through the machinery of clubs and shebeens. Well, what have we done with clubs? It is an extraordinary thing that in 1904 it never occurred to the authors of the Act of that year, for which they claim credit because in the interests of temperance they were providing an easy and well-greased machinery for the reduction of the number of licences, to think that it was necessary at the same time to take precautions against the multiplication of clubs. No, the discovery on the part of these Gentlemen that there should be a prevention of the multiplication of clubs is very belated. But what have we done in regard to clubs? Compare the state of the law as it was left by right hon. Gentlemen opposite to the state of the law which will be brought about when this Bill receives, if it does receive, the Royal Assent. We have, with regard to clubs, brought in a number of most important safeguards and provisions, always having in view throughout the importance of doing nothing which would appear to interfere with the liberty of well-conducted and orderly clubs, or to discourage the creation of such institutions wherever there is a genuine demand for them. We have enabled persons to come forward who object to the renewal of the registration of a club, not only on the grounds specified in the old Act as to conditions which a club must observe, but on the ground that it is used or is going to be used mainly as a drinking club; and next there is this important addition which was made in Committee, and which, I hope, will have very beneficial results in checking a growing evil in regard to clubs which fall within the denomination of what is known as the tied house. There, I believe, was a real danger, a danger that, if public-houses were suppressed on a considerable scale, the brewers and persons interested in the trade might, under the guise of financing a club of this kind, bring into existence what would be practically a substitute for that which the law has got rid of. Then we have strengthened—indeed, we have created—a penal liability for permitting drunkenness or for an illegal sale of liquor, unless they can prove a diligent use of their power. We have given a right of entry properly safeguarded, as I think it now is, by requiring the order of a magistrate to the police, so that when there is reasonable ground, which the magistrate can act upon, to believe that the premises are not used for the *bona fide* purposes of a club, but are being used as a drinking shop, the police will be able to come in and procure the necessary evidence and get the registration of the club cancelled. And, finally, we have prohibited the sale of liquor for consumption off the premises. When all these changes of the law have taken place I am sanguine enough to believe that we shall have set up a series of safeguards which will enable public authorities to discriminate, and discriminate accurately, between clubs which ought to be encouraged and which ought not to be interfered with, and clubs which are the disguised haunts of persons who go there for the supply of drink and drink alone, and which are intended to take the place of the suppressed public-houses. I believe those provisions of the Bill now command general assent. I believe they are recognised—and recognised not least by those who are the representatives of Labour in this House—as having been carefully devised with the object of not imposing undue obstacles to the formation and conduct of *bona fide* clubs, and at the same time they are not wanting in stringency, and even severity, where the privileges of a club are being abused.

I should have been glad to have confined my observations within a shorter compass, but I felt it my duty to make this general survey. The House has spent upon the Bill, I think, the most laborious hours of a laborious session. It is a Bill which, upon its first introduction, was received with an amount and an intensity of hostility, which, I can assure the House, did not in the least surprise the Government, who were its authors. We calculated upon that; we should have been foolish, indeed, if we had not. That makes it all the more agreeable to me to acknowledge, as I do to-day, that in the months which have passed my hon. friends who sit behind us here, often exposed to misrepresentation and obloquy of a peculiarly offensive and wounding kind, supported us in putting the provisions of this measure through with an assiduity and a loyalty for which we cannot be too grateful. I believe they have not done so because of a blind mechanical instinct of party discipline. I think they have done so because they recognised that in this Bill, sneered at as it has been by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, as a kind of *omnium gatherum* of fads and fancies, you have the first serious and solid attempt which has been made in our time to advance the cause of temperance reform. What may be its fate elsewhere it is not for me to predict or ever to forecast. It is sufficient for me to-day to know that it represents the considered judgment of the Commons of England. It is as a plan wisely conceived for a great purpose that I now for the last time submit it to the approval of this House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke): In moving the Motion which stands in my name, I shall endeavour not to occupy an undue share of the very restricted time which is left to us for the discussion of an important matter. I agree with the Prime Minister that the Bill has attracted remarkable attention in the country. I think that attention has not only been due to the great interests which are at stake, but, more than that, to the sound instinct of our people which shows them how vast are the possibilities and precedents which this Bill raises. We have been told in eloquent terms that this Bill which to-day leaves this House represents at any rate the considered judgment of the Commons of England. Speaking with the utmost respect I am tempted to say, if that is so, so much the worse for the Commons of England. The Bill has been indeed amended in Committee. It consists of alternate layers, thin layers which have been discussed, and thick layers of which no detailed examination has been made. The major part of the Bill is unchanged except for those Government Amendments which have been voted without discussion. But those portions of the Bill of which examination has been allowed have been amended and re-amended in the most bewildering fashion and up to the very last moment. As this Bill leaves the House it contains upon its face at least one totally unintended provision which the Government have been prevented by their closure from correcting, but which they hope to correct elsewhere. Our debates are concluding in a strange fashion, are they not? We have just listened for an hour to a speech from the Prime Minister, and what was that speech? Was it a defence of the principles of the Bill on which we have been so long engaged? It was, as the right hon. Gentleman said it would be, an exposition not of the details but of the main provisions of the Bill. Are we not aware, having discussed this matter since February, what are the main provisions of this Bill? Was not this curious and interesting speech, to which we have just listened, an argument, was it not perhaps an appeal addressed to an audience not present in this House? Was it not perhaps a handy synopsis suitable for the use of other students of a somewhat complicated measure? I am not concerned with these matters. I am concerned to look at the Bill as a whole, and I refuse to look at it otherwise than as a whole. I find the time-limit, I find reduction, I find compensation inextricably interwoven in this Bill, and I accept or I reject the Bill as a whole. Looking at the Bill as a whole I find it, notwithstanding our microscopic examination for many weeks, in its texture, in its essence, and in its principle unchanged, and it appears to me not merely a Bill unworthy of the support of this House, but a measure which it would pass the wit of man by any Amendment, however drastic, to convert into a wise or politic measure. I base my own opposition to the Bill upon four grounds. I oppose it as being a measure rooted in injustice and oppressive even in its machinery. I oppose it next as being an unwarrantable interference with the reasonable liberty of individuals. Without making any imputations on the personal sincerity of any supporter of this Bill, without under-rating in any way that body of most estimable if somewhat unenlightened opinion which supports it in the country, I yet oppose it, as my third ground, because it is a dishonest Bill. I speak without offence. I say that it is not a fearless, impartial, and sincere application of its alleged principles to the subject matter of the legislation. My last ground of opposition is that I am persuaded that it would be of no avail as an instrument of social reform. The hon. Member for Kingston, who has rendered such assistance to the House throughout these debates, at the outset of the illuminating speech in which he moved the rejection on the Second Reading, invited the House to reject this Bill on the ground that while not advancing the cause of temperance, it violated the principles of equity. At the conclusion of these long debates, I invite the House to reject the Bill upon these grounds. I base my opposition to the Bill upon the two grounds that it is unjust and that it would be futile. On the first main part of the Bill, the reduction of licences, I desire to say very little. As the Prime Minister observed, we are all agreed that there should be a general and a considerable reduction of the number of licensed houses. If what you want is a reduction of licences, I think you do not need any Bill, and I am quite sure you do not need this Bill. The changes which this Bill makes as regards the reduction of licences are changes of machinery, and of principle. As regards machinery it substitutes a Procrustean method and the rigid and pedantic exactitude of a central bureaucracy for the flexible and just system with a local levy and local control which is working at this moment so admirably. As regards principle the change it makes is, by tampering with the basis of compensation, to reduce the just and beneficial process now going on into a matter of hardship and injustice. I desire to concentrate myself upon what seems to me to be the very heart and marrow of this Bill, the time-limit in its widest sense, which seems to me to be three matters, and not those three matters only, and certainly not any one of those three matters, but a sinister combination of those three matters. At a fixed future date insurance is to end. At a fixed future date the monopoly value is to be confiscated and meanwhile insurance is to be levied. It is idle to say what terms might have been fair if other terms had been proposed. These are the terms proposed, and as a whole in their combined action we have to consider them. Was ever a lawful industry so proposed to be dealt with in any civilised country in modern times? The true and real explanation of this Bill is that it is promoted by those who in their hearts believe this trade is contrary to public policy, and is in itself an undesirable thing and should be suppressed. I understand them, if I do not share their opinion, but if that is their view, let them come forward honestly with proposals for the abolition of this trade on the ground of its undesirable nature and do not let them attempt indirectly to destroy it by the imposition of impossible conditions. We are not concerned here to consider whether or not the Bill is merely confiscation in a fair colloquial use of the word, or in its stricter sense. But I listened to the Prime Minister basing himself for the third time in this House upon the nature of a licence and challenging us for the third time to reconcile the Act of 1904 with our opposition to this Bill, and it falls to me to follow on this difficult matter a great master of debate, and to endeavour to erect this challenge. In this matter of time-limit and confiscation we have been too apt to concentrate out attention upon the rights and position of the individual licence-holder. The argument on our side, which is so familiar, how the individual licence has always been treated as property in the Courts and in the market, by the tax gatherer and the rate collector, and the argument on the other side of the undoubted discretion of the justices—these are arguments which are concerned with the individual licence. But we are not proposing here to reduce an individual licence. We are proposing to destroy to a large extent the general body of licences in this country. The Prime Minister, in the course of his masterly exposition in introducing the Bill, dealt, as he has dealt more shortly this afternoon, with this matter. He dealt with the question of confiscation. He based himself and his proposals upon the essentially revocable nature of a licence. He pointed out with the utmost lucidity how the expectation of the licence-holder was twofold, how he hoped for renewal and how he hoped for protection, and he went on to say, having pointed out how the justices might defeat both these expectations, in the one case by refusing to renew and in the other by granting more licences—

> "It follows that in either case, without any violation of the law, without inflicting any wrong for which any single human being could seek any legal redress, either or both of the expectations upon which the monopoly value rests might be frustrated and the whole fabric of the monopoly value itself brought down to the ground."

In speaking on the Second Reading of the Bill he put the matter even more strongly and more shortly, and he said—

> "There would be no legal wrong (as I have pointed out) in respect of which any person could complain in any Court of Law for redress if we had proposed to enact that every existing licence should come to an end at the end of the current year."

I agree with the right hon. Gentleman in his statement of the law as to the nature of the individual licence, but with the greatest respect, though with great confidence, I join issue when he comes to draw his conclusions from it. He says — "This is no confiscation. Confiscation is for us to take away without compensating existing rights. We do not propose confiscation, and I have, therefore, to show that there is no legal right. If we were to take away every licence to-morrow there would be no confiscation." The words used by the Prime

Minister on the Second Reading were not so absolutely perfect as we are accustomed to from him, because I take it we cannot here infringe a legal right, nor can any person go to a Court of law and complain of what we do. But his meaning is as clear as can be. If you are passing an enactment the effect of whch is to take away from people property which could be taken away by some other authority under an existing law without infringing their legal right, that is not confiscation, whatever equitable rights may arise. The argument then is this. The justices can take away any licence, therefore the justices can take away every licence, and therefore if the Government take away every licence they would not be guilty of confiscation. I agree that the justices can take away any licence. I agree that if the justices could take away every licence there would be no confiscation if Parliament did so. Where I respectfully differ is in saying that because the justices can take away any licence, it therefore follows that they can take away every licence. It is the profound fundamental fallacy at the very basis of the Bill. They have no such discretion. The justices are entrusted with a great discretion. It is a discretion which has to be exercised judicially. It has to be exercised under the law, and in accordance with the spirit and the words of the law. The words of the judgment in the House of Lords are—

> "That they may not by evasion attempt to repeal the law which permits public-houses to exist."

And in another part of the judgment it is stated that the Legislature most clearly contemplated that licences as a whole would continue to exist, without, of course, the imposition of destructive conditions. They, therefore, must exercise their functions subject to the spirit of the law which exists and guides them, not for the purpose of taking away, but for the purpose of providing, under regulation, places of public entertainment for the people. Let us take an example. Supposing the justices in any licensing district were to say: "We are temperance people. We think this is undesirable. We will refuse to renew licences in our district at the expiration of the current year." No man can doubt that the justices would be restrained from any such proceeding. Let us go one step further and suppose the justices, instead of saying that, said: "We have need of local funds and this is an undesirable trade. We will not renew except upon the condition of payment to local funds in the nature of payment for monopoly value. They did say that in one case—an individual case only, and it was an original grant. The justices required the applicant for a new licence to pay a sum of money in aid of the local rates. They were at once restrained by the Court, which observed that they had no legal right to do that. If the justices cannot do it in one case, *a fortiori* they cannot do it in all, and *a fortiori* all the justices in the country cannot do it as regards all the licences. It would be the grossest and most palpable instance that could possibly be imagined of that which is described in the judgment of the House of Lords as an attempt by evasion to repeal the law which exists for the continuance of public-houses. It follows that while in the case of an individual licence there is no more than an equity to considerate treatment, in the case of licence-holders collectively and of the trade as a whole, there is a vested interest—as good a right, subject to the risks and incidents of their trade, to go on supplying people with beer under this recognised industry as bakers and butchers have. Subject, I say, to the incidents of their trade, one of which is the risk of individual reduction, which discounts the value of each licence. It fell, in the case tried before Mr. Justice Kennedy, to estimate the actual money value of that risk of individual reduction. One of these houses was an ante-1869 house, not subject to this risk, and the other was an ordinary licensed house and was subject to it, and in that case it was held that the actual difference in money value due to the risk of individual reduction was one year's purchase. I, therefore, say this Bill is based, not merely upon confiscation in its colloquial sense, but actually is a measure of confiscation in the strictest and most technical sense, and I am not concerned to inquire whether it be £100,000,000 or £150,000,000 which is going to be confiscated. Whether £100,000,000 or

£100 the principle is the same, and to these people we are, it seems, to say: "The State is going to take from you valuable property, but not now. You are to be granted a respite. Use it to advantage. Toil and save, and when the time comes and we take from you your property we shall not take your savings too." It would have been a strange thing if the leaders of Socialism in this country had not been quick to see the great possibilities of this measure. Their intentions are not hid from us. They look forward to carrying by successive attacks the outworks by which the fortress of private property is defended in this country—licences first, mines next, land next, and so on to all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. They have made no secret of the light in which they regard this Bill. The hon. Member for Blackburn sees no reason why he, as a Socialist, should resist this convenient precedent, that might be adapted to property in railways, mines, and land. This Bill establishes two precedents of which use will be made hereafter. The first is—if you give a man notice beforehand, you do him no wrong in taking away his property. The other precedent will apply where compensation is to be paid to the late owner of the property. He will ask for "market value," and he will be answered on the lines of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley to the publicans: "It is true you bought the property on market value and could not have got it without. But how came you to buy at such an inflated price? Have you not recognised the danger? Have you ignored my speeches and pamphlets? Where have been your ears and your eyes? You have known for long past what we intended to do, and you are the author of your own misfortune." The practical result of this valuable doctrine is that for the purposes of compensation it substitutes the partisan valuation of a political opponent for the real ascertainment of the true value. With regard to precedent we do not need to be told—I hope we shall not be told—that a public-house is a different thing from a railway, and that both of them differ from a mine. What I want to know is this—What is the material difference of principle for this purpose? Does not the licensed trade depend mainly on capital and industry with the assistance of a certain measure of monopoly value, the necessary result of State regulation? Compare railway shareholders and their moral rights with brewery shareholders and their moral rights. Railways are regulated by the State. They exist under the sanction of something which you may almost call the licence of the State; they rely on capital and industry and a measure of monopoly due to regulation by Parliament. What is the difference between the two? I might pass on to the case of mines where there is a strong element of monopoly, or to land where the element of monopoly also operates. But the question I wish to ask is this—Is the hon. Member for Blackburn right in saying that this is a precedent which will enable him to take possession first of railways, then of mines, and then of land on his triumphant career to other conquests, and to substitute a time-limit with the chance of insurance for compensation? Is he right in saying that? If he is right, then we know where we are. Let it be frankly admitted. But if he is not right, I challenge with respect some speaker who follows me in this debate to-day to point out what is the difference which makes it right and just to apply this principle to the licensed trade and wrong to apply it to other classes of property. I am not going to speak at any length of the time-limit. I have made it clear that I object to it in principle and in its essence as it exists in this Bill. I do want to say one word upon the general question of hardship and upon the general question of equitable right, passing from the criticism of the principle of the time-limit which I have ventured to make. It is not so much a question whether a period of twenty-one years is enough or not. Is it the long agony and slow destruction of twenty-one years which these people are looking forward to? Is it not something much nearer to their doors? This trade is carried on on borrowed money. What is the position of the trade? Scared by the mere chance, however remote, of this Bill becoming law, the mortgagee is already moving. I will not trouble the House with many figures, but may I mention two cases which affect the small livings of insignificant people. There is a large public-house in South London which was bought by the licence-holder at this time last year for £40,200. He had a fifty-three years lease. He put down his own money amounting to £3,400, of which £1,200 was for equipment. He borrowed on mortgage, £38,000—one a first mortgage of £18,000 at 5 per cent. payable on six months notice, and the other a second mortgage of £20,000 at 5 per cent. payable on demand. That man will get, if he is reduced on the present assessment, for his £40,200, taking a fair average of his chances of reduction, £5,000. I pass from that. That is not the only risk or danger. The passage of this measure into law would have a disastrous effect upon the value of every licensed property in the country, and of every property connected with licensed property. What course will the mortgagees take? The first mortgagee, who happens to be a woman in this case, may run the risk of selling. If she is well-advised, I do not think she will sell with any confidence that she will get her £18,000. She may put in a receiver. It is just possible that the second mortgagee may redeem, and his receiver may be substituted for that of the first mortgagee. What becomes of the man who paid his money last year? He would be in the street with a liability of £20,000 hanging round his neck. What has he done or what have his people done that they should be treated in this fashion? He has done nothing but invest his money in a lawful industry, relying on the continuity of British law and policy. Let me take one more case. There are cases where a licence-holder has other property. This is the case of a man who died six years ago, and his business was carried on under an order of the Chancery Division. The lease was for sixty-two years, and there was no profit rental. The property was valued for death duty at over £26,000. The widow would, if reduced, get £2,906. There is a 5 per cent. mortgage of £24,000. The widow has a small amount of other property which her husband left to her. If this Bill passes into law there is no question that the mortgagees will come in. They knew of the existence of the other property. This property with the mortgage of £24,000 would not be worth £15,000. The mortgagees will sell, and they will sue the executors for the balance on the personal covenant, and they will take from this poor woman and her children every farthing. I read a speech delivered at Brighton not long ago by the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on this Bill, in which he spoke with his wonted eloquence of what goes on in low public-houses on Saturday nights—the sorrow and the grief of it, the outcry, the struggles, and the tears, and if I remember rightly he appealed to his audience to think of the tears of the drunkard's wife. No one would speak otherwise than with respect of one who has to bear so hard a lot. But if you pass the Bill, you will not dry the tears of one single drunkard's wife, but you will set flowing the tears of other people who have done no wrong—tears of unmerited misfortune and undeserved misery. I wish to say a word about the Act of 1904 which was so pointedly referred to by the Prime Minister. It was an Act which was bitterly opposed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and they are bringing in this Bill to reverse its most useful provisions, but I notice that they run to it for shelter with great agility whenever they think it can assist them. I cannot imagine a more defensible and impregnable position than that Act occupies. It looks in the face facts that have to be dealt with. It recognises the precarious nature of the individual licence, and the right of the general body of licences to continue. What it does is to enforce on the trade compulsory insurance. One other thing it does. It enacts that reduction shall not go forward faster than the resources of the trade will allow. I think that one great mistake was made in that Act—a mistake of verbiage. It was a mistake to use the word "compensation" so prominently in that case. There is no compensation under the Act of 1904. Compensation is where a man is paid money by others. If a man insures himself against sickness, he receives money when he is sick; he is not compensated if he falls sick. The licence-holders mutually put their money together, and those on whom misfortune falls share it out among themselves. Compensation in that sense—and that is the essence of my complaint—the mere chance of a man insuring himself—can only be justified, as it was justified in the Act of 1904, by the expectation of an indefinite survival and of sharing the profits which you have purchased in reduced competition. What this Bill does is to destroy the expectation and retain the payments. The Leader of the Opposition the other day compared the methods of this Bill to those of the buccaneer. It was an unduly indulgent comparison. The highwayman, at any rate in this country, always gave his victim an election :—" Your money or your life." This Bill takes the money, but does not allow the licence-holder the ransom of his life. In that respect it appears to me to fall below the general average level of the morals of the footpad. As regards the adequacy of the compensation I will only say this. Since the trade cannot bear more than a certain levy it follows that you must do one of two things. You must either reduce more slowly, or give inadequate compensation. The Government have chosen the latter alternative. I should have liked to discuss the measure more in detail; to have said a word about the machinery and the absence of a public hearing and a public appeal. I believe the people of this country will endure a measure of bureaucracy, provided the bureaucrat is not an autocrat, and they will endure an autocrat if he is a man living amongst them and whom they know, but I think, the unpleasant combination of bureaucratic-autocrat and autocratic-bureaucrat which has been reserved for the Government of popular freedom to invent will be received without enthusiasm. I wish I had time to deal with the attack which the Bill makes upon private liberty which is really of more importance than the attack upon property; but I pass from that point to my complaint that the Bill is partial and insincere. It ought to have been applied to Scotland and to Ireland, where apparently the need for such legislation is not less than in England. We hear much of the political power of the licensed trade in this country; but has the licensed trade in Ireland no political power? In conclusion let me say that the whole Bill must fail unless it is proved to be valuable and practical as a means of reducing or preventing drunkenness. We have appealed for any tittle of evidence that it would do so. None has been forthcoming, and experience and statistics are against it. We have had nothing but reiterated assertions. In theory prohibition should prevent drunkenness; in practice it does not. It cannot be suggested that this Bill is wanted by the temperance man or the man who wants liquor in moderation. And how any reasonable man can suppose that a man who drinks too much would be better for finding two public-houses in the High Street instead of three, I cannot understand. I want to say that already our national revenue and future are based upon the consumption of drink to an extent that is neither safe nor decent. The Prime Minister has challenged us as to what we would do in order to diminish the hideous evils of drink. Members on this side of the House are not insensible to the evils of drink, and if I were asked what I would do, personally I should have no hesitation in saying: " Give the Act of 1904 a fair chance—give it time to work, and if in a short time you come to me and say the rate of reduction is insufficient, and acts partially, I will give fair consideration to that matter." But for the present let us wait and see. Let us allow the old forces of religion and the newer forces of education and science to work out hand in hand their mighty work among the people. I ask for a period of rest for the publican, the grocer, and the club. We are confronted with the state of things alluded to by the Prime Minister at the outset of his first speech, in an emphatic phrase. We have an improvement in temperance in the widest possible sense of the word which is one of the most admirable and striking features of our national life. Then why can we not have a rest? We are told there shall be no rest. The publican is threatened from the highest quarters that if this Bill does not become law there will be punitive taxation. This way or that, he would be made to squeal. Well, we shall see whether, if the event contemplated occurs, the people of this country will consent to see taxation degraded into a tool of partisan vengeance and an instrument of torture. Of course, the Bill will be carried by a majority in this House, which does not justly represent the state of public opinion. It has been supported by a majority in this House, but I believe the people have been confidently anticipating its destruction. There was no mandate for such a Bill as this, and the people have let slip no constitutional opportunity of condemning it. They see that it is futile, oppressive, and insincere. They feel that if, contrary to the general hope and expectation, it becomes law, it will be a portent of disaster; that it will be a precedent for plunder; that it will interfere intolerably with their reasonable liberties; and above all and more than all, it will break faith with those who have trusted the State, and will sully the honour of the country. I beg to move.

EARL WINTERTON (Sussex, Horsham): I rise to second the Motion of my hon. and learned friend that this Bill be not read a third time to-day. And I do so with all the more pleasure because my hon. friend has stated the reasons against the Bill so conclusively and completely that it will not be necessary for me to detain the House by a long speech. I do not wish to travel over the familiar ground again, and I do not wish to put once more to the Solicitor-General those questions which my hon. and learned friend has put to him and his colleagues in the Ministry continuously during the past six weeks, and to the majority of which we have received no answers. I do not wish to make observations which have never been disputed by the Government or their supporters, and I do not wish at all to go into details. It is, in fact, impossible within the short time we have at our disposal to travel over the whole of the details of the Bill. At least a dozen of the clauses in the Bill are in themselves large enough to fill the pages of an ordinary Bill. Neither do I want to deal with the question of the monoply value, which was so admirably dealt with by my hon. and learned friend, or any of all those other questions in the Bill from the question of the monoply value aud the time-limit to that which constituted the one little piece of humour in the measure and contemplated the captain of a passenger vessel leaving his place on the bridge and at the wheel and going into the saloon and asking the passengers if they could say "Mixed biscuits and the British Constitution," in order to test their sobriety. I merely want to say a word or two about the financial provisions of the Bill. Broadly, both in the country and in the House; one big argument has been brought forward in favour of the financial clauses. It is said that the State must, in the public interest, get back the control of the monopoly at whatever cost. I believe that is the contention put forward by the hon. Member for Appleby. I will only make one comment on that statement. It is a statement made to support their case by Governments all over the world, and especially in new countries, who are about to put through an exceedingly dubious financial transaction. Whenever in a new country they have a flagrant piece of jobbery it is always justified on the ground that it is for the good and benefit of the State, but it is a contention absolutely new in British politics. Mr. Gladstone never dared to put it forward; and it shows the danger to which we are exposed by the extreme democratic Government to which we are now subject of getting into the state of affairs from which so many of our democratic neighbours are suffering. As to the so-called temperance clauses of the Bill—and no word has been so prostituted as the word "temperance" in the debates—I want to ask the Government and hon. Gentlemen opposite a question which has never been answered though repeatedly asked—What is the root idea at the back of these so-called temperance clauses? In order to deal with this question I want to follow my hon. and learned friend in his statement that one of the most remarkable, most pleasant features of social life to-day in this country, in every class, almost universally throughout the United Kingdom, is the great increase of sobriety and of temperance which has been going on now for twenty or thirty years. That is abundantly justified by facts, by statistics, and by the testimony of every person who is qualified to speak. We may take, for instance, the relative amount of sobriety in 1908 and in 1890 on Bank Holidays, Christmas Days, and the like. There is not a single police authority, from the chief constables downwards, or magistrate throughout the country who will not say that the advance made is wonderful. May I quote a phrase which was used by a very prominent inspector of the Metropolitan police district, on the occasion of the recent Commission to inquire into the Metropolitan police, in reference to the general state of London? He compared the streets of the town with what they were twenty or thirty years ago, and said they were like the aisles of a cathedral. Anyone who knows anything about the great forces of the Crown, the Army and Navy, knows that the increase of sobriety in them has been perfectly marvellous in the last twenty years, and taking every branch of society generally—no matter what it may be, or where it may be—you have this same evidence of the increase of sobriety. I am compelled to ask a question, which has not been asked from any side of the House, and that is to how great an effect has the law generally, or the action of the Legislature generally, during the last thirty years, been instrumental in bringing about sobriety? I am prepared to say, without the least hesitation or fear of contradiction, that it is only to a very, very slender and limited extent. Take the Act which was passed by right hon. Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. The effect of that Act has been to decrease in the four years it has been in operation, I believe, something like 2,000 or 3,000 public-houses, and yet there has been no corresponding decrease in drunkenness. That decrease in drunkenness has been going on for thirty years, and I believe it has been progressive.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): So have licences. They have been reduced in the last thirty years, more especially in proportion to the population.

EARL WINTERTON: That is not really the case. My point is this. Since the year 1904 there has been an enormous decrease in the number of public-houses, something like 3,000 public-houses being reduced in four years, but drunkenness has not been affected to any corresponding extent due to the abolition of those public-houses. I believe that that can be proved conclusively and that that Act proved conclusively to all impartial persons that you cannot do much by Act of Parliament to prevent drunkenness, or to use the old adage which cannot be disputed: "You cannot make a man sober by Act of Parliament." That Act carried out what is wished by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, the decrease of public-houses, and what is their attitude on this question? That is not sufficient for them. The fact that the number of public-houses was being decreased to an extent that it had never been decreased before and that there had been no corresponding decrease in drunkenness falsifies the result they prophesied. That would not satisfy hon. and right hon. Gentlemen. For years they had been going about the country holding up the licensed trade as a bugbear and a scarecrow to the general public, declaring that it was a thing which frightened away morality and every social reform in this country and was a great bar to the realisation of their ideals. That is the way in which they constantly appealed to the electors. They also had the cry of "dear food," and as soon as that and the question of Chinese labour began to diminish as electoral forces, they began a great campaign in favour of temperance, which was headed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the President of the Board of Trade, with all the forceful language of which those professors of urbanity are capable. It was a campaign in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley and the hon. Member for Appleby also took a prominent part, each bearing a banner with the inscription "Excelsior" upon it, which in this case means: "Go as far as we can to injure the trade and to take away from it all that which rightly belongs to it." They started out with flying colours and an exceedingly blatant brass band, meetings were held all over the country, and eventually the Bill was brought in, and I do not hesitate to say that the whole effect of that campaign so far as it influenced public opinion was null and void. The Bill has received absolutely no support; in the country bye-elections admittedly fought upon it have ended disastrously for the Government, and there is not a tittle of evidence to show that the public are in favour of it. What is that absolute and dismal failure due to? I will in a very few words tell the House what in my opinion the failure of this agitation has been due to. I think first of all it is largely due to the violence of the language of the supporters of the Bill. The President of the Board of Trade said the Tory Party consisted of "Lords, lordlings, and a few brewers." That is not the sort of phrase that you would think would be used by anyone who had become a Cabinet Minister, and had passed the rubicon of responsibility. I might, but I will not, go to the country and say that the Radical Party is composed of "Rats and Pharisees," and I only mention that fact as showing how a person like the right hon. Gentleman, supposed to be in a responsible position, can use these violent phrases, which are thought to be smart, but which have no effect in inducing people to vote for their Bill. I think the main reason why this agitation has so conclusively broken down in the country is because the public know too much—the impartial public, the great public, referred to in the speech of the President of the Board of Trade, in a very fine passage, which is uninfluenced by political considerations, and does not aim at power, and which is only aroused in time of crisis—that great public thinks that all Governments, not merely that of the party now in power but all Governments, do not take the course which they absolutely and honestly think to be the right one, but they take the course which they absolutely and honestly believe to be nearest to the right ones which their supporters will allow them to take. That is the view which the public have about all Governments, particularly about the present one, and it is because they have not logically carried out the policy which they professed to believe in, that restrictions upon drink and facilities for drink are bringing about less drunkenness, that this Bill has been such a dismal failure from the electoral point of view. That great public has heard the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman and has given its verdict. That brings me to what I venture to think is the most important part of the so-called temperance aspect of this Bill. As I understand it, the whole attitude taken up by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, and especially by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley, is that facilities for drinking mean drunkenness, and, therefore, if you reduce the facilities for drink you will have less drunkenness. Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that is broadly the position which he has taken up; it is always what I have understood. I do not agree with that myself; I think it is subject to a great many reservations, but I have always understood it to be the attitude which he took up, and which hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway on both sides take up. May I mention the hon. Member for the Rhondda Division of Glamorgan in this connection. He made a remarkable and eloquent speech in which he said that in Wales the majority of people were formerly never able to go to business before Tuesday, owing to the headaches caused by the excessive drinking they indulged in on Sunday.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid): The hon. Gentleman did not say majority.

EARL WINTERTON: I am willing to accept as a correction "a large number." I have never listened to a speech which gave me more pain; it was a speech delivered with such obvious sincerity and truth. The hon. Gentleman was asked what his views were on the subject of clubs, and he replied with absolute sincerity that he would like to see clubs done away with, and that he would vote against them. That is the whole crux of the matter. It is said that facilities for drink lead to drunkenness, but how does this Bill propose to deal with these facilities? I want to ask the Government a question in all sincerity and earnestness, because it is most important. Supposing that one of their number or myself had a friend who was addicted to drink, and was in a fair way to ruin his career by the excessive consumption of alcohol? What would be the place out of which we should be most likely to keep that man? What steps should we take to stop him from getting drink? Should we be most likely to keep him out of the public-house, or to prevent him from going to the grocer's shop, or the club? I am assuming, for the purposes of my argument, that this is a person who has a reputation for drink, and over-indulgence in alcohol, therefore the keeper of a restaurant, or an hotel, or a public-house will know his habits and that if he serves him with a large amount of intoxicating liquor, he runs great risks of having his licence taken away, if the man goes away and says he got drunk in his place. But what happens if he goes to a grocer's shop? The grocer if the man were sober could not refuse to serve him with half a dozen bottles of whisky, and the man could quietly go and soak in his own house. It is no affair of the grocer's. Do we understand that Messrs. W. and A. Gilbey or the grocers whom they supply, ask whether a man is likely to get drunk on the wines or spirits they supply him with? It is just the same if he goes into a club. Does anybody deny that it is just as likely to do harm to a man and to prevent him from becoming a better citizen, if he gets his drink in a club instead of in a public-house or restaurant? The club question is really the root of the matter. I have no hesitation in saying that this is one of those questions which it is difficult to discuss in a democratic Assembly whose Members are dependent upon votes and to get a clear issue upon it. That is because hon. Members on either side are anxious to avoid and unwilling to state unpalatable truth. Any Member for an industrial constituency who has a number of *bona fide* clubs in that constituency will be a bold man to come forward and say they are very bad things indeed. I cannot understand how the hon. Member for Barnard Castle or the right hon. Member for the Spen Valley, holding such views as they do, can possibly for a moment support even *bona fide* clubs, because the whole question is one of obtaining liquor, and not whether it is obtained under proper or improper conditions. I believe those hon. Gentlemen must hold the view that a *bona fide* club is a bad thing. They must hold the view that the members of a *bona fide* club, who are often young men who desire to get on, could better employ their time in evening continuation schools or in some other way. It has been exceedingly difficult to get a clear discussion on this matter. Nobody has ventured to go into the question of the advantage of a *bona fide* club compared with a *bona fide* public-house. I have only two clubs in my constituency; and I do not mind whether the members of those clubs voted for me or not. I am quite ready to give my views on the matter. A thing that is very often put forward in the country is that an Englishman's club is his castle, and that, therefore, they cannot be considered in connection with the sale of drink; but that idea seems to me to be rather out of date. A man who chooses to keep a disorderly house cannot plead, if that house is raided, that his house is his castle and that what goes on inside has nothing to do with the general public. Therefore, I do not think that the "Englishman's house is his castle" argument is a very strong one. It is a two-edged argument, of course, but I have never been able to see how it can hold water. Is a *bona-fide* club a so much better place than a *bona fide* public-house? Are such places for the sale of drink as the beer gardens in Germany, and the open-air cafés in France, where a man can go with his wife and family and get his minimum of alcoholic liquor and listen to the music even on Sundays, worse from a moral point of view—for the question is a moral one—than the club? The President of the Local Government Board has said it was easy to get drunk in a public bar of the public-house, but it was perfectly easy to safely soak and steadily swill in the parlour of a drinking club. It is far easier to get more liquor in a club than in a public-house, because in the one case you have the strength of public opinion, and in the other you have no public interest at all. It is not disputed that public-houses generally are well conducted. That is not denied even by the extreme advocates of temperance. If that is so in every respectably conducted public-house, if a man goes in to obtain refreshment and drinks more liquor than is good for him, he is always liable to his friends or his business acquaintances taking notice of it; but what happens in a *bona fide* club? You get twenty or thirty people who form a club. They may be people who are accustomed to meet and who see no harm in a man having what is colloquially known as a good time and among whom tales are told closely bordering on the indecent. They form a club. If no one is seen coming from that club drunk, public opinion sees no harm in the club. If, therefore, the argument that increased facilities for drinking mean increased drunkenness is used the Government cannot legitimately only deal with public-houses; they must deal with the clubs as well. The same thing applies to grocers' licences. Of course nothing will be done in that matter. Under the Bill, facilities for drinking will be decreased in the public-house and increased in the clubs and the grocers' shops. This Bill will remain as a monument to the unctuous hypocrisy of the British people for all time. Why is a man addicted to drink less likely to abuse his privilege to injure himself in a club than in a public-house? I sincerely hope that in the event of the Bill not becoming law the Government will appeal to the country and ask their opinion upon it. We are not the least afraid of what the result will be. It has been constantly stated by the Government that the Tory Party must take the responsibility for how the House of Lords deals with the matter. I do not admit that, but I say that if the Government dissolve on this question to-morrow there is not a member of the Tory Party who will not be delighted. We believe that the whole country is in favour of our attitude and against that of the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. SIMON (Essex, Walthamstow) said the noble Lord who had just spoken had occupied a portion of his speech with a detailed examination of the comparative merits of clubs and public-houses. Whether the provisions of this Bill were adequate as regards clubs or not was no doubt an important matter, but the Bill was primarily directed to the future regulation of public-houses, and he would pass from clubs with this observation—that it was a little suprising that the zeal with which the clubs were denounced by hon. Members opposite was exactly in proportion to the zeal with which public-houses were praised. That might be explained perhaps by the fact that the trade had a direct and immediate interest in public-houses, whereas there was some doubt as to whether it was directly interested in clubs. The Prime Minister to-day had pointed out, as he had done before, that there were two fundamental propositions lying at the base of this Bill. If those propositions were ill-founded, the Bill was rightly denounced, but if they were well-founded, the Bill certainly ought to pass. The first of those propositions was that a substantial reduction in the number of licensed houses was a material contribution to the cause of temperance reform. The second was that after a proper lapse of time it was just and expedient for the State to resume ownership and control of that monopoly which by its own favour was created. Those propositions had been defended from the Ministerial side of the House from the beginning as propositions which were fundamental to the Bill and which could be abundantly justified. He did not say that the first proposition was the one factor which dominated the hopes of the advocates of temperance reform, but it was a material element and an element which the Legislature could control. Here they ought to have the support not only of those who maintained that this was a good Bill, but also of those who maintained that the Act of 1904 was a good measure, because the Leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, claimed for that Act that it was the greatest contribution ever made to the cause of temperance reform on the special ground that it was machinery devised for securing the reduction of licences. Those were the very grounds on which the Act of 1904 was justified.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): That is what it has done.

*Mr. SIMON said the right hon. Gentleman, more faithful to the Leader of the Opposition than the noble Lord, considered that, by reducing the number of licences, the Act of 1904 had made a substantial contribution to the cause of temperance reform. If that was the meaning of the right hon. Gentleman's interruption, it might be asked why should they not leave the Act of 1904 alone? That was the solution of the hon. and learned Member who had moved the rejection of this Bill. Let them give the Act of 1904 a chance, said the hon. and learned Member. But there were three good and sufficient reasons why the Act of 1904 could not be left alone. The first was that its operation in the direction of reduction was a waning operation. It could not in the nature of things continue as rapidly as it had begun, because the first houses to go were those most obviously condemned, and the fact of their removal gave the houses which remained a greater value which made it more difficult to remove them at an equal rate of compensation. The second was that the Act of 1904 was so designed that it operated in licensing areas according to the zeal of the magistrates, the activity of the police force, and the strength of public opinion, so that in the very area where there was the greatest need for substantial reduction the Act of 1904 left it open to slack administration or indulgent benches of magistrates to leave things as they were. He would give a third reason. Under the Act of 1904, however desirable to suppress a given public-house in a given neighbourhood, the ability to do so was conditioned entirely by whether there was a surplus in the local compensation fund. They might expect to find that in an area where the need for taking away further licences was conceded by independent people they were not able to take away those licences, because they had not got a compensation fund in that area available for the purpose. He submitted that this Bill in these matters would effect a definite improvement in the law and an improvement along lines which the right hon. Gentleman opposite regarded as sound lines of advance. If they were going to reduce by a continuous process excessive numbers of public-houses, they must do it by a system which secured that it was to be done with regularity and not sporadically. They must do it so that the compensation fund was a fund which was available to meet the case which was most needed, wherever that fund was raised from, and they must do it so that they knew where they were going to in the course of the next dozen or twenty-one years. For those reasons, he submitted that the proposition that they did well to secure by legislation a systematic reduction in the number of public-houses was established and established by the consent of both sides of the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the Amendment had spoken as though the Bill at a blow was going to take away all the licences of all the licensees, as though the scale to be found in the first Schedule was a scale of impossible rectitude, only tolerable in a country inhabited entirely by gentlemen like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley and the hon. Member for the Appleby Division. That was the contention suggested by the criticism that if the Bill passed they would see instead of the magistrates' right to take away any licence enforced, the magistrates' right to take away every licence insisted on. He would give an illustration which came to him the more naturally because it had to do with a portion of his own constituency. He had been visited by deputations from the licence-holders in his own constituency. He found that so far as regarded Walthamstow the actual figures were these, that according to the last Census there was a population of 95,131, and that, applying that population and the density of that population to the area which the first Schedule specified, 190 licensed premises was the maximum to which this Bill at the end of fourteen years expected that area to come. At this moment in that area, an area not consisting entirely of teetotallers, there were only twenty-seven full licences and eleven beer on-licences, or a total of thirty-eight; and so, when a deputation came to him some weeks ago and complained that the Bill was going to effect an unwarrantable invasion on the rights of those who wished to drink, he asked those gentlemen what they would say if someone was to come forward and propose to set up in that same area, side by side with their existing houses, twice or three times as many houses as were there now. Those gentlemen, giving their honest opinion and being singularly qualified to judge, assured him that if any such proposal were effected they would regard it as an invasion upon their own rights, and that they considered that the existing facilities for getting drink in that area were abundantly sufficient. If that was the situation in an area of that sort, what became of the suggestion that this was a Bill which was going to enforce some impossibly rigorous rule by which the honest working man who wanted his reasonable glass of beer would have to go some incredible distance to get it? The standard set up in the first Schedule was a standard which, however moderate it might appear to us, accustomed as we were to the conditions of our country, would be regarded as a scandalous exaggeration of what was necessary in the Colonies. While he desired to see reasonable facilities left, he submitted that it was not right to treat this Bill as though it was going to enforce some rule of some anchorite upon the British public, with the result that their legitimate demands for legitimate facilities for a legitimate supply were going to be frustrated. So much for the first of the two fundamental propositions upon which the Bill was based. As to the second, he submitted that the second proposition was this, that after due notice it was just and expedient that the State should resume the value of that monopoly which the State, by its own favour, had created. He was anxious to deal with this part of the matter by presenting to his own mind and to the House what he understood to be the contention of the other side. He believed he could state it without provoking a contradiction, and he trusted he might state it not only as representing the view of the more extreme Gentlemen opposite, but as expressing their more moderate view. Their view as to the nature of property in a licence was this. They said (or at any rate they said in the House of Commons) that it was quite true that the licensee had no right to an indefinite renewal of his annual licence, but they said that, though he had no right to that annual renewal, he had an expectation, a reasonable expectation, and a substantial expectation, that in the ordinary course it would be renewed, and they said—and so far as he was concerned the proposition was perfectly true—that that being so, anticipating that it was more probable that the licence would be renewed than not, relying on this reasonable expectation, honest citizens had set up a trade, widows and orphans had had their money invested, income-tax had been paid while they were alive and death duties had been paid by their estates after their death; and they further said that when licensed property changed hands in the market the price demanded, and obtained, was greater than it would be if it was certain that the licence was going to be taken away at the end of the year, and much greater. This was quite true, and he made no complaint that it was so stated, but where he found himself compelled to join issue with hon. Gentlemen opposite was when they drew the deduction that the State, when it, in its unfettered discretion, decided that a renewal for another twelve months was not to be desired, had got to pay that market value. In order to illustrate what was the real fallacy of their contention, he would ask leave to supply an illustration. There was a state of things contemplated with avidity by some hon. Gentlemen opposite involving a change in the fiscal relations of this country which would produce a precisely corresponding claim and situation. Let them take a manufacturer or trader who was enjoying the benefits of a scientifically devised tariff. He might say that it was quite true that by the constitution of this country finance was an annual matter, reviewed every twelve months; that it was quite true that as a matter of law this tariff might be changed at the end of any twelve months, but that still there he was in possession of a business which acquired much of its value from the favour of the State, because the State had given to him by its financial arrangements an aliquot part of a monopoly which he could not maintain if there was free trade in his commodity, just as the publican said it was owing to the favour of the State because he had got this monopoly and other people had not, that he was able to make profits which free trade in drink would make it impossible for him to make. But what followed? Were they really to understand that, involved in fiscal reform, there was to be fourteen years notice, or twenty-one years notice, before the tariff could be altered? Was it really to be the fact that the manufacturer or dealer in some other article than drink was to be able to say that year by year when he was taxed he was taxed on the basis of his business enjoying an expectancy——

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): But that practice obtained when the corn laws were abolished.

*MR. SIMON said that when the corn laws were abolished the abolition, he believed, was carried in 1846, and three years, and no more, elapsed before the repeal took effect. Moreover, no compensation was paid to anybody.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S. E.): May I ask if the licensing law is not at least 800 years old in this country?

*MR. SIMON said that that was not quite the proposition upon which he was attempting to get a little elucidation. He had given a true analogy. The situation which might be expected to exist under such a state of affairs, and which did exist in countries now enjoying a tariff, was a situation where the protected manufacturer came forward and said that it was quite true he had no legal right to insist on the continuance of the protection, but he claimed it on the ground that he expected it, and that he had erected his business on the faith of it, and he called the Government robbers if they dared to interfere with it. The truth was that about this matter sooner or later either the public interest or the private interest must prevail. It was because they who supported this Bill believed that the notice given to the private interest that the public interest must prevail was sufficient that they so warmly followed the lead given them in the passing of this Bill into law. He would like to say a word with regard to monopoly value, though that was not dealt with in terms by either the hon. Gentleman who moved or the noble Lord who seconded the Amendment. There was a great deal of confusion about it, and that confusion entirely arose from the failure to distinguish between two things pointed out by the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General, the goodwill on the one hand which was peculiar to the locality of the premises, and the goodwill on the other hand which was peculiar to the energy and enterprise of the occupant. One of those things was properly to be taken into account in Schedule A; the other was not. The idea that this distinction was peculiar to public-houses could not possibly be maintained if hon. Members would consider what actually happened in other trades. There was a shop which hon. Members who were also lawyers knew very well, opposite the Law Courts, where they could get a shave. Nearly every lawyer at the Common Law Bar had occasion to go there many times a week. When the occupier of that shop was assessed to Schedule A for income-tax it was rightly considered that his shop had a special value because it was close to the Law Courts, and it would be monstrous if it was not so treated; but that was a different proposition from suggesting that individual enterprise, the goodwill which came through the individual, was a goodwill which was to be taken into account when measuring monopoly value. In so far as the goodwill was due to the desire of the customers to deal with a particular person, they claimed that that ought not to be an element in monopoly value, but in so far as it was due to the fact that the premises were at a place where they caught traffic, that element did naturally enter into monopoly value and was rightly included in Schedule A. The noble Lord opposite referred to what he called the old tag, that very well-known saying that they could not make England sober by Act of Parliament. That was quite true, but he did not think the noble Lord for the moment observed the language in which that expression was couched. They could not force upon a subject population the regulation of a despot designed to improve their morals; they could not make England sober if England did not want to be sober, but the merit of this Bill, and the reason why they so passionately desired that it should pass into law, was that it was not an attempt by some Oriental despot to impose his rule upon a subject people. It was an effort of the people themselves. The Bill was an expression in that House of an opinion which had spread among independent people throughout the country. He should not be contradicted when he said that it expressed the overwhelming opinion of every religious body of this country. He should not be contradicted when he said that it was the overwhelming opinion of organised labour in this country. In those circumstances he submitted that the maxim had no application. If this Bill were the edict of some emperor to procure the improvement of the national morals it would fail, and deservedly fail; but it was precisely because it was supported by the vast majority of disinterested people, because it was the expression of the will of the people, and not of an autocratic despot, that it would be effective for its purpose and do something for the improvement of the country.

Mr. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said the hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken, as many hon. Members opposite had done, in somewhat belated praise of the provisions of the Act of 1904. They saw now in that Act merits which, judging by their criticisms in that House, they were totally unable to discern at the time the measure was being discussed by them when in Opposition a few years ago. The hon. and learned Gentleman said the operation of the Act was inadequate for the reason that it was waning, and that it could not possibly produce the same result in the future that it was producing at the present time. Possibly that criticism was made as some justification for introducing this most bitterly controversial and complicated measure. He thought, however, that the more reasonable proposition would have been that they should wait until the operation of the Act had really commenced to wane before they introduced this legislation. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that the operation of that Act had not been satisfactory, because in important areas where it was wanted it had not been applied owing to the excessive indulgence of the local justices. He asked the hon. and learned Gentleman, instead of dealing in generalities on this point, to tell them what areas he had in his mind in which the operation of the Act of 1904 was specially necessary, and to which it had not been applied at all under these circumstances.

Mr. SIMON: Are there no instances where the licensing magistrates have recommended the suppression of licences because they were not required, and the compensation committee had found that it was not possible to carry the whole scheme through for want of funds?

Mr. F. E. SMITH said the hon. Gentleman was now dealing with the second point, a totally distinct point, namely, not as to indulgent magistrates who would not carry out the Act, but insufficiency of funds to carry it out. He asked for a justification of the statement, made repeatedly both inside and outside the House, that there were cases in which the Act should have been applied and in which it had not been applied through laches of the justices. Up to the present no such instance had been brought. In the speech of the Prime Minister, only an hour and a half ago, they had been told that in the Act of 1904 they had curtailed the discretion of the magistrates, and it was strange that the hon. and learned Gentleman should, within such a short space of time, get up in his place to support this Bill on the ground that the local justices could not be trusted in connection with this identical question. The hon. and learned Member had offered the House a singular analogy in the merchant who profited as he said by a change of tariff. Mark the argument. Such a man it was said would be in the same position as the licence-holder, or, for the purpose of the hon. and learned Member's argument, in an analogous position; and if the licence-holder was entitled to demand compensation on the basis of the market value then the person who suffered loss because of a change of tariff was equally or similarly entitled to compensation. With the greatest possible admiration for the ingenuity of his hon. and learned friend, he had never in his life heard of a more trivial comparison than that. And he would tell the House why. The whole basis of the case for market value, in so far as it was placed on the ground of public integrity, was that compensation was paid to the licence-holder because he had bought in the open market, with the encouragement of the State, that of which the State was going to deprive him.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): Does not the shareholder in the protected trust company pay for his capital in the open market?

MR. F. E. SMITH said that on a proper occasion he would be very pleased to discuss the whole question as between free trade and protection with the hon. Gentleman. What he was pointing out was that the hon. and learned Member opposite, in taking a merchant's business as an illustration, was dealing with a man who had been affected by the tariff; and in comparing the merchant with the licence-holder he in the latter case was dealing with a man who had bought what he had in the open market, while in the other case he was dealing with a person who had received benefit from a change which had been made independently of his own exertions. ["No, no."] He had given an answer to the hon. and learned Gentleman's argument which, in his humble opinion, was an adequate one. But there was a further distinction. In the case of the licence-holder the State was, after a period, taking the whole benefit of the licence for itself. In the tariff case the State had not sold to the man that of which they dispossessed him, as in the case of "The Coach and Horses," of which the House had heard *ad nauseam*, but of which they would observe the pertinence from the point of view of the illustration put by the hon. and learned Gentleman. In the tariff case the State had neither sold to the man that of which he was dispossessed, nor taken for its own purposes that of which it dispossessed him. If that did not introduce a distinction between the two cases put by the hon. and learned Gentleman, then he was very sorry that he failed to appreciate his point. The most amazing part of the speech of the hon. and learned Member was that in which he recommended the Bill to the House because it was not the Bill of an Oriental despot, but a Bill introduced with the will and consent of the people of England. A little earlier the Prime Minister had said that the Bill was the result of the considered judgment of the Commons of England. That led him to put to the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite a question which he hoped would be answered in the course of the debate. Was the Bill recommended to the House of Commons and to the House of Lords as being a Bill which the majority of the people of the country did want, or as being a Bill which, in the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite, the majority of the people of the country, if they were well advised, would want? It was perfectly clear that the case really put forward in the House was and must be that it was a Bill which the majority of the people of the country did want, though he confessed that on that point he found the utterances of Ministers a little obscure and ambiguous. The Prime Minister had said, for instance, that the Bill was neither introduced with the object of gaining votes, nor was it likely to gain votes. That was a somewhat significant admission in the case of a Bill which was not introduced in the spirit of an Oriental despot, but introduced under a democratic system. The Liberal Press was obsessed by pictures of inebriated electors carried prone on shutters to vote against the Bill, while the Party bands played "Beer, glorious beer," as the election proceeded. That was the view put forward by a portion of the Press as to recent bye-elections, and it was of an astonishing character. They had now a provision in the Bill which was designed to deal with the case of elections, and it was curious to note how it was sought to place restrictions on the very people who were said to desire this measure. The view was carried so far that while the rulers of this country, the electors, under a democratic system passed to the booths with majestic tread to record their votes on the tremendous issues of peace or war, or to pronounce upon the economic mysteries of free trade or protection, they were to be muzzled by their admirers opposite lest they might make drunken beasts of themselves on the way. That was the position in which they were left in the case of a Bill which hon. Gentlemen opposite said the people really did want. *Vox populi, vox Dei* but it spoke with a hiccough unless the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley took appropriate precautions. He proposed for a moment, if the House would allow him, to recall the attention of hon. Gentlemen opposite to the pure milk of democratic doctrine. The proposition which he put before them was this, that if the majority of the country did not want the Bill, neither the House of Commons nor the House of Lords had the slightest right to pass it, whether they thought the people ought to desire it or whether they thought the people ought not to desire it. He would, with their permission, test the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman that the people of the country desired this Bill. He confessed that he approached this part of the subject in a little more detail than he would have done if the hon. and learned Gentleman had not made that extraordinary claim. In the year 1906, before the Bill was introduced, there were eight bye-elections, and only one Conservative win. In the year 1907, there were eleven bye-elections and only one Conservative win. In the year 1908 the threat of this Bill became more definite, and it was known that it was shortly to be introduced. The House would observe the consistent course of the by-elections since 1908. First of all, there was the election in Mid Devon, where a Liberal majority of 1,289 was made into a Conservative majority of 559. Then there was the Ross division of Herefordshire, where a Liberal majority of 312 became a Conservative majority of 1,019. In the Worcester election the Conservative majority was increased from 129 to 1292. In the South Leeds the Conservative poll increased from 2,126 to 4,915. In Peckham a Liberal majority —[Ironical MINISTERIAL cheers]—yes, if they could not persuade the Peckhams of the country in favour of the Bill, then they were falling back on the Oriental despot theory. They had got to persuade their Peckhams that this Bill was a just Bill, and if they failed to do it, then the rejection of the measure was justified. In regard to Peckham hon. Gentlemen opposite were well advised in indulging in melancholy cheers. In that constituency the Liberal majority of 2,339 became a Conservative majority of 2,494. He supposed that was the justification for closing public-houses on election day. But there was not a single case of conviction for drunkenness. In Dewsbury the Conservative poll of 2,954 was increased to 4,078. In North-West Manchester, despite all the ability of the President of the Board of Trade, they sacrificed one of their most brilliant Members before the democracy. The right hon. Gentleman fought the election on the terms of this Bill, and the result of the poll was that the Liberal majority of 1,241 was converted into a Conservative majority of 429. In East Wolverhampton, the Liberal majority of 2,865 was reduced to a majority of eight. In Newport a few days later the Conservative majority of 166 was increased to a majority of 951, and that in spite of the bribe of old-age pensions. In the next instance, Pudsey, the seat next to that of the right hon. Member for Spen Valley, was lost; the Liberal poll falling from 7,043 to 5,331. In Haggerston the Liberal poll was reduced by 1,000, and finally, in Newcastle the Liberal seat was lost, the reduction in the Liberal vote being 6,703. In face of these figures how many hon. Gentlemen would come forward and say with confidence that the majority of the people of this country were in favour of this Licensing Bill? There had been a most pathetic illustration quite recently, one which excited compassion. Many hon. Gentlemen opposite were admirably fitted for peerages by aptitude, taste, generosity, and party loyalty. He had noticed that the King's birthday list was entirely unadorned by their names. He would point out that if twenty stalwarts had been created Peers, able to develop their massive eloquence in another place, and without the restriction which the consciousness of constituents imposed, they might have leavened the whole gilded loaf. But they lingered in that House mere commoners, humble democrats, with no gleam of hope except a paltry baronetcy, simply because no English constituency was safe. Why was it ?

*MR. McCALLUM (Paisley) : The hon. and learned Gentleman does not say that applies to Scotland.

MR. F. E. SMITH : No ; the Bill did not apply to Scotland, because the Government must preserve some cities of refuge for Cabinet Ministers who lost their seats in England. Why was it that this Bill had become so unpopular that the Government would pocket the affront if it should be rejected in another place ? Let the House never forget the tone in which the Bill was first of all commended to the country by the Government. The ship of the Government was to go down into the abyss, if necessary, with flags flying. That was one of the boasts. But why had it become common knowledge that if the Bill met with the fate which was anticipated elsewhere, the Government had no intention of going down into the abyss ? It was just because the Government were the Eastern despot of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite that they would have no appeal to the people. If the Government were satisfied that by an explicit appeal to the people of the country on the terms of this Bill they could come back to coerce the majority in another place, did any honest politician say that they would not make that appeal and come back with a mandate to correct the House of Lords as they had been threatening to do during the last three years ? It was the rankest political hypocrisy to suggest that this Bill had the support of the people behind it. The reason why it was so unpopular in the country was because it was extremely tyrannical in all its provisions, and even after three years of the present Government we were still a free people. The local option proposals empowered the cellared classes, to whom hon. Gentlemen opposite mainly belonged, to coerce the uncellared classes and to deprive them of facilities for obtaining alcoholic refreshment if they so wished. These provisions were to become operative in fourteen years, though in fourteen years that House of Commons would probably be known only as the Mad Parliament. If it was right that there should be local option in the constituencies in order to prevent excessive indulgence in alcohol, why was it not right to have local option in the House of Commons to prevent the consumption of alcohol at the bars and in the smoking-rooms ? [AN HON. MEMBER : Bring in a Bill.] He did not believe in such remedies. Supposing the Ministerialists could obtain a majority in favour of abolishing the supply of alcohol in the smoking-rooms, would they or would they not be justified in doing so ? One answer would be that there was no such mischief in the smoking-rooms or restaurants of the House as would justify a remedy so drastic in its character, but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Rushcliffe division had said that he had seen many sad instances of excessive drinking on both sides of the House.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said the hon. Member had evidently been misled by one of those telegrams which appeared in the papers. He never used any such words or anything like them.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he entirely withdrew, of course. He was quoting from a newspaper report. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would deny that he said he had seen melancholy cases in this House of the results of drinking. If he said he did not say so, he would withdraw.

MR. ELLIS said he never used any such words. If Mr. Speaker would give him an opportunity when the hon. Member sat down he would read the exact words which he used.

MR. F. E. SMITH : If the right hon. Gentleman would read them now it would be far more convenient.

MR. ELLIS said he was sorry to detain the House. This, he might say, was an address in a chapel at Scarborough, in April, 1908, at what was called a "Pleasant Sunday Afternoon." He said—

> "Almost everyone who has lived forty, fifty, sixty, or more years in this world can call to mind scores of persons who within his own knowledge have fallen victims of this terrible agent for evil."

He might say, by way of parenthesis, that he was not speaking of the Bill. The subject of his address was the relation of the State to the sale of intoxicating liquor.

> "I myself, Mr. Rowntree has reminded you, have been for over twenty years now in the House of Commons. I suppose I have been associated with several thousand men during that time. I know I have. And looking over that twenty-two and a half years now, as I was doing only the other day, I have been saddened to think of those men, of great high promise some of them, who have fallen victims to this terrible evil, whose careers have been blighted and whose lives have been wrecked in this sad manner. There are at the present moment in the Commons' House of Parliament men sitting there who are in danger of falling, and who know they are in danger of falling, from this evil. We hear sometimes that it is a temptation which education, cultivation of the mind, will enable a man to overcome. That is not so. It is confined to no class in the community."

MR. F. E. SMITH said he was very much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his courteous intervention. He took it that what he said was that he had known such cases in the course of his experience of the House of Commons, and that he knew many men now on whom he could put his finger if he wanted to——

MR. ELLIS: The hon. Member must not substitute words of his own. [Cries of "Cowardly," "Withdraw," and "Play the game."]

MR. F. E. SMITH: The right hon. Gentleman spoke of a number of men at the present time——

MR. ELLIS: I have read the words which I used.

MR. F. E. SMITH: said that the point was this. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of men or a number of men now in the House of Commons who were in danger of falling. He for one, could not sufficiently thank him for leaving them anonymous. But the right hon. Gentleman greatly qualified the pleasure which he should have in sitting next to him at dinner. ["Hear, hear," and cries of "Order."] If that were true, and if the conception of local option were sound, let them set an example by denying themselves something. Might he suggest that hon. Members below the gangway, whose interruptions seemed to him a little unmannerly, should justify—what badly needed justification in the country—their own good faith by denying themselves something?

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): Some of us have never started yet.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he was referring to those who had started. Another obnoxious feature of the Bill was its method of dealing with Sunday closing by denying opportunities to obtain refreshment to those who did not keep liquor in their houses, and had no club. No hon. Member who had spoken in support of the measure had had the honesty to face the difficulty concerning clubs. Members opposite had replied invariably that there were more stringent conditions in this Bill than in any previous Bill. The Solicitor-General shook his head. They were not dealing with bad clubs only, but with well-conducted clubs and well-conducted public-houses. They could only reduce the great evil by reducing the facilities to drink, but there was nothing in the Bill, from beginning to end, to prevent a club being established in the same street, with the same sale of liquor, and the same *clientele* face to face with the abolished public-house. Then there was the case of off-licences; and the way in which they had been dealt with by the Bill had done more to discredit it than anything else. It was true that off-licences dealt more specially with whisky than with beer, and whisky was more injurious than beer. It was true also that women went to the grocers' shops and that female drunkenness was the only drunkenness that was increasing, according to statistics, and it was true that off-licences were not affected by the reduction provisions of the Bill. But there was such a thing as gratitude in politics. For twenty years the holders of those off-licences had supported the Government in every moral cause the Liberal Party had taken up during those eventful years. The holders of those licences were very often Welsh; they were pioneers in the cause of Welsh disestablishment, and they were the salt of the passive resistance movement.

They groaned in anguish over Chinese slavery, particularly when they reflected that the Chinaman took opium instead of whisky. If men like that who had given such support to the Liberal Party were to be betrayed on the petty ground of consistency a blow would be struck at their common human nature, and while the Bill might gain in honesty an irreparable blow would be struck at their standard of political gratitude. From that point of view the Government were wise in leaving off-licences and clubs outside the scope of the Bill. He had no time to deal now with the various points which had been made. The fact that, instead of providing, as was done under every other sumptuary law, that the seller should not supply less than the buyer paid for, under the Bill they provided that the seller should not provide more; the amazing provision—regarding the captains of steamships, which required that when the storm raged and the breakers roared the captain, instead of being on the bridge, was to be in the second-class cabin ascertaining whether a suspected passenger could pronounce the word "suppositiousness" without giving cause for suspicion; the final and crowning piece of humour that Wales was to have a most drunken nation clause of its own—these points and the confiscatory, tyrannical, and hypocritical elements in the Bill had sickened the people of the country. It was certain that if they were given an opportunity, which he trusted they would be given in the next few days, of showing whether they agreed with the principles of the Bill, they would express themselves with no uncertain sound. While hon. Gentlemen opposite were there to praise Cæsar, they on that side were there to bury him, and he had seldom attended a funeral in higher spirits. He would add this final observation, and he doubted whether a single Member for an English constituency sitting opposite could say as much. With a full knowledge that if the House of Lords rejected the Bill there might be an appeal to the country, he gave his vote that night without the slightest apprehension of his constituents or of the consequences.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): We who sit on the Labour Benches, from the introduction of this measure onward, have given both in the country and in this House our steady, consistent, determined, and enthusiastic support to the proposals of the Government. Having regard to the long debates which have taken place, I think it is only right that, at any rate, one spokesman from these benches should put forward our attitude on the Third Reading of this Bill, and our reasons for adopting that attitude. That is what I propose to do. May I just venture one remark in reference to the speech we have just listened to from the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool. As I listened to that speech I was forced to come to the conclusion that it was one more illustration of the many futile attempts that have been made throughout these debates to get up a case against the Bill. I hope that I shall never have to listen to a speech from one of my colleagues with so much offensive matter in it as that which we had heard from the last speaker. [OPPOSITION cries of "Withdraw."]

EARL WINTERTON: We have to listen to something worse——

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: The noble Earl says that they have had to listen to something worse. Supposing we admit the soft impeachment, those who come from the University ought to set an example to those who come from the mines and workshops of the country. I have sat through pretty nearly the whole of this debate. I listened to the magnificent and almost perfect case for the Bill stated by the Prime Minister, and I listened to the case against the Bill which was attempted to be made out by the hon. Member who moved its rejection. I have come to the conclusion that the latter speech was an excellent defence of the case for property and the best that has been made or attempted to be made both in the country and in this House since the introduction of this Bill. I venture to say that in this instance the case for the rights of property has never been established either in the country or in this House. I have, however, risen more particularly to give a few reasons why every hon. Member associated with me on these benches who is capable of being present in this House this afternoon proposes to give his vote for the Third Reading of this measure. First of all, the Bill appeals most directly to us because of the excellent provision it contains in Clause 1. As we have heard from the Prime Minister in his excellent speech, the proposal made in Clause 1 is intended to deal effectively and more expeditiously than the Act of 1904 does with the redundancy of licences. Why does that point appeal so strongly to my colleagues and myself? Where is it that the redundancy of licences obtains? In which localities do we find them? With all respect, I venture to say that we find them more closely associated with the districts from which my colleagues and myself have come, and with which we are closely connected, than with the districts represented by other hon. Members of this House. It is a well-known fact that the redundancy of licences obtains in working class districts, and as I have said on other occasions, that redundancy has been brought about because of a disregard of the only method the working classes have of expressing their opinions against the creation of these licences. Those who have been connected closely with working-class organisations know full well that the working classes have made repeated attempts to appeal to those who have the power of granting these licences to stay their hand, as the facilities for obtaining drink were already sufficiently numerous, and as many of them, unfortunately, because of their economic circumstances and demoralised environment, were compelled to have recourse to them they have asked that the temptations that stood at almost every street corner should not be increased, but, if possible, should be lessened. If that is so, and I think I am correctly stating the position, I hold that any measure that, in the first place, makes a definite and, I believe, a very effective attempt to lessen the facilities for obtaining drink, and will to some extent, I will not say in an equal proportion—thus reduce intemperance, and to a very large extent correspondingly reduce the temptation in the way of those who ought not to be tempted—such a measure, if there were no other provision than that in Clause 1, would commend itself to the judgment and receive the unqualified support of Labour Members. I remember very well when I was associated with one of the largest engineering works on Tyneside, I began, as many others associated with me did, pleading for the betterment of our fellows by dealing with those with whom we came in contact in the workshop, and I can look back and remember quite well how many a man has said to me: "Yes, your advice is the right advice. I want my children to follow in the way that you are going, but I have gone too far. The temptation is too much for me and I cannot resist it when the houses are facing me at every step that I take." I may be told this is a reflection upon the working classes of the country, but those who know anything of working-class life will admit that it is only too true a picture of large numbers of the working classes. We have a right to give our enthusiastic support to a proposal which in the next fourteen years will reduce by one-third the facilities for obtaining drink and thus lessen the temptation in the way of those with whom we are directly associated. We have been told that we are proposing in this clause to take a step which is an uncalled-for interference with legitimate rights of property, that by the time-limit proposal and by the re-assertion of the claim to the State of the monopoly value we are taking a step which, however laudable the end that we seek to accomplish, we are not justified in taking, or as some hon. Gentlemen above the gangway has said, we have no right to do evil that good may come. The whole burden of the charge against us of the mover of the rejection was that we are going to perpetuate an unwarrantable interference with the rights of property. The hon. Member has referred to the attitude of Socialists so far as this property question is concerned, and has quoted from the speech of the hon. Member for Blackburn. But that speech is capable of an entirely different construction from that which the hon. Member had led the House to believe. We join with the Government without reservation in the assertion of the principle that the State ought to regain the monopoly value. Let there be no two opinions on that point. But because we claim that the State ought to regain that which the Leader of the Opposition told us in 1904 should never have been taken from it, there is no justification in others assuming that we should go from that to an unlawful and unwarrantable interference with the legitimate rights of property in other forms. I will tell hon. Gentlemen above the gangway what our position is in regard to interfering with the rights of property where those rights are legitimate. They need not have any misgivings about it. The records of Socialists outside the House and of Labour Members, the majority of whom have for years past been associated with public life, are known. What has been their policy in regard to the legitimate rights of property? We had an illustration only last week in the debate on the Port of London Bill. There there was a legitimate form of property under discussion. The Government had chosen two alternatives. They could take that form of property either by agreement or by arbitration. The Government proposed to accept the former and had entered into an agreement for the legitimate taking over of this property. Did those Socialist Members, who have been so scornfully pointed at, attempt to upset the policy of the Government? No. They supported the Government in having made the agreement. What has been the policy that they have supported time and time again in connection with the carrying out of improvements? The House knows full well that in these improvements, especially the laying down of new tramway systems, a policy which has been very largely influenced by men representing our way of thinking in connection with public bodies—in every case where there has had to be interference with the legitimate rights of property, the policy of Labour members on public councils has been the policy which the Government has adopted in the case of the London docks—the policy of arbitration or agreement. Why then it may be asked, are we not pursuing that policy in regard to licences. It is for the very same reason that dictated the policy of the Leader of the Opposition in the Bill of 1904, when he chose to differentiate between interfering with the legitimate and illegitimate claims of property by making a levy upon the trade to bring about its own partial extinction. That is how it strikes me. If the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters can substantiate this legitimate claim to a form of property in a licence I hold that the great grievance which the trade feels is not against those who are supporting this Bill. Their great grievance is against the Government that passed the Act of 1904. Did that Government carry out the well-recognised public policy in dealing with property for the purpose of carrying out a public improvement? No. Supposing some public authority said: "We are going to widen a street. In order to do so we are going to take away a draper's shop. But we will call the whole of the drapers of the town together and tell them we are going to take away one competitor of theirs, and to enable us to do so they must, by levy, provide a fund in order to bring about the extinction of this competitor of theirs." That would be held to be positively ridiculous. And yet that is what the last Government did. They did not enact that the money should come from public funds, but they said: "We will place upon the trade a levy to bring about its own partial extinction," and to that extent they differentiated from the well recognised policy for dealing with legitimate rights in property for the purpose of carrying out public improvements. We only follow that example if we say that we ought to differentiate between the legitimate and the illegitimate claims of property; and the Socialists, when they come to deal with other forms of property, will not deal with them as they are dealing with the licensing question, but will pursue that form of public policy which has been in operation for years past, whether at the hands of Parliament or of other public authorities. But this charge that we are interfering in this way is not going to prevent us from re-asserting our claim that the State as a whole has a right to the possession of the monopoly value. But this is not the only point that commends this Bill to the Labour Members. It has often been said in the campaign in the country that those opposed to the Bill were astonished at the attitude of the Labour Members in supporting the measure, having regard to the injustice it was going to do to working men. Much talk has taken place about liberty. We support the Bill because we claim that when it becomes law it will give to the working classes of this country a power they have never hitherto enjoyed. Instead of curtailing their liberty it confers upon them a new power—a power which the working classes have used wisely in some of our Colonies, and in some of the States. It has always been a very great grievance with working men—and especially with that type of working man who is practising, as he was always advised to practise, thrift and sobriety—the man who takes advantage of the municipal trams, and, instead of living in the slums, goes and lives in a new working class district—it has always been a grievance with them, that, in spite of having removed from the redundant public-house, and in spite of having invested his savings in some kind of property, the brewer's agent has followed him in some unexplainable way, a licence has been granted, and the new district has been subjected not only to a process of deterioration as to the value of property, but to the other processes of demoralisation that sometimes accompany public-house licences. For the first time when this Bill becomes law working men will have some say as to whether these licences shall obtain. They will have a say now so far as new licences are concerned, and they will have full say at the end of fourteen years, and no part of this measure commends itself more strongly to Members on these benches than that part which confers power on each locality to decide this important question. I know that we are almost in the last hour of the debate, but I ask the indulgence of the House while I reply to one or two of the points which have been made [Murmers of dissent]. I think the objection raised above the gangway is most unfair; I have listened attentively to three speeches on behalf of the party above the gangway, and we shall have a fourth before the debate closes. I am the only speaker for the Labour Party, and yet it would seem that some thoughtless Members begrudge a little time to me to take part in the debate. [Cries of "Go on."] Oh! I am going on. I was going to reply to one or two of the points made by hon. Members above the gangway. One strong point of the hon. Member for the Walton Division and others has been that this Bill ought not to have a Third Reading, and I believe they went so far as to give advice to another place that it ought not to be passed into law because the people had given no mandate. It has been said that at the bye-elections and by every legitimate form at their disposal the people have given evidence that they are opposed to this measure. Let us look at this proposition. A great deal has been said about the bye-elections. I have taken the trouble to go into this question. After all, bye-elections do interest us on these benches. I find that from 1906 to 1908—three years—there have been forty bye-elections. Eight of these, or 20 per cent. have gone against the Government. I noticed that the hon. Member for the Walton Division in dealing with this point—and he endeavoured to make a good deal of it—said not a single word about the three-cornered contests. Now I hold that he ought in all fairness to this House, when trying to make out a case against the Government, to have given those cases where there were three-cornered contests. He ought to have given the position taken up by the Labour candidate in the contests, and if the Labour candidate was in favour of the Bill, as I venture to say in nearly every case he has been, the votes given for the Labour candidate ought to have been given to the Government. That, and that only, would have been a true statement of the position. I follow the Conservative Press very closely, and I have always understood that the victories we have heard so much about were tariff reform victories. I am surprised that our tariff reform friends are not cheering that. It cannot be that they are tariff reform victories on the morning after the declaration of the poll, and that when we come to debate the Third Reading of the Licensing Bill in this House tariff reform is forgotten, and that they are anti-Licensing Bill victories. May I ask which they choose? We have had other bye-elections. If bye-elections have to be taken into account, they should not only be taken into account during the present Parliament, but during other Parliaments. What are the facts of the case? I have already referred to the Bill of 1904. We had bye-elections before that Bill was introduced and after. I will venture to say that bad for the then Government as the position was before the Bill was introduced, it was positively worse after the Bill was passed into law. From 1900 to 1904 there were fifty-four bye-elections, and eleven of them, or 20·4 per cent. were against the then Government. I do not think there is much comfort to be derived from the standpoint of bye-elections. Two or three hon. Gentlemen above the gangway have really made a very definite point about the results of bye-elections influencing this House. That is the appeal made to us to-day. They say we ought to pause because the bye-elections have gone against the Government, and, therefore, against the Bill. Very well let me see how this operates. I will not give my own opinion. I will give an opinion to which I ask the Members of the House to pay attention, because it is much more valuable than any opinion I could express.

> "I do not for one instant admit that the bye-elections are a test, or ought to be regarded as a test of public feeling. They are, of course, a test of the feelings of a particular constituency at the time the bye-election takes place. They are not, and they cannot be made, the index and the test of what the feeling of the people of the country is as a whole. Any doctrine that is inconsistent with that is, in my judgment, not only wholly unconstitutional in theory, but wholly unworkable in practice."

That is the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition delivered in this House on 29th March, 1904. If we are going to take this doctrine of the mandate to its logical issue, so far as this Bill is concerned, I want to go back to the last Parliament and to make a claim. I want to say that if the doctrine of the mandate is to obtain at all—and I am not prepared to carry it too far—I have no hesitation in saying that there is much more force in the claim that the Government of to-day should pass this measure into law by all the means at their disposal than that the Government of 1904 should pass their measure. Why do I say that? Does anyone doubt that this question of licensing reform was before the country at the last election?

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): Yes.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: The hon. Member for Hackney challenges my position. I venture to say that if the election addresses of hon. Members opposite and on these benches are examined, you will find that a great majority of them made reference to licensing reform, and especially made reference to the mischievous policy of the Act of 1904, and pledged the candidates to the reversal of that policy.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: No Minister pledged himself.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I will leave the Ministry to look after themselves. I say that that is the state of the case taking the great bulk of the rank and file of the Members of this House. But supposing that I take it for granted that the Ministry did not pledge themselves, they would not have been in any other position than that which Members of the Conservative Party were in at the election of 1900. I am going to close with one more quotation. I am putting before the House the question of the mandate, and I claim, and I think I have shown, that the majority of hon. Members referred to this question in their election addresses. But what about the election of 1900? What about the mandate behind the Bill of 1904?

> "It was impossible that the country should at this moment have anything in its mind to exclude the paramount interests which events in South Africa had necessarily excited. He asked them, whatever their politics might be, or to whatever Party in the State their allegiance might be given, to remember that this election did not turn on any of the other questions which had divided the electorate in previous elections in that constituency. It was a new issue to be governed by new considerations."

That was said by the Leader of the Opposition in appealing to his constituents in 1900. That seems to me to demolish completely the doctrine that they had any mandate to impose on the country the Act of 1904. That being so, I venture to say that they ought not to take that as a point against the Government. I venture to say that 75 per cent. of the Liberal Members, and a larger number of the Labour Members, pledged themselves to secure, if possible, the reversal of the Act of 1904. In conclusion, let me say that we think the case for the Bill has been established. We have given it our unqualified support, and to-day we rejoice at the opportunity of once more going into the Lobby in order that we may assist the passage of this measure, believing that when it becomes law not only will it regain the monopoly value to the State, but that its excellent temperance provisions will do something to promote the sobriety of the nation.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): There is a great deal in the speech of the hon. Member for Barnard Castle to which I would like to reply, but we have a large subject, and I must, at the outset, say this by way of apology to the hon. Member. None of us complains of the hon. Member's speech. It is not our fault that the time is so short, and that adequate time is not given for the Third Reading of this Bill. Personally, I should like if I could to leave adequate time for the right hon. Gentleman who is to follow, but I have been put here to speak for the Party to which I belong, and really I am bound to consider that more than my own feelings, and to put the case as strongly as I can for that Party. There is only one part of the speech of the hon. Gentleman to which I shall refer. He spoke of the speech of my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Walton Division as offensive. What I want hon. Gentlemen to bear in mind is that they must not judge of the offensiveness of speeches by whether they like them or dislike them. Our business is not to make speeches to please our opponents. The only limit which I personally put on this matter is to say nothing which I do not myself believe to be true. Now on this occasion I should certainly very inadequately represent the feelings of the Party to which I belong, and I should very inadequately represent my own feelings, if I did not speak very strongly in regard to this measure. It is the last opportunity we shall have of saying anything about it in this House. The duty has devolved upon me of giving it, as well as I can, its final kick. Before I make that attempt I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with every word said by the Prime Minister as to the courtesy and patience with which the Solicitor-General has conducted the Bill through Committee. I do not think it is inappropriate on the final stage of the Bill to discuss for a moment the spirit with which it has been recommended to this House and the country. It has a little changed. We have not had the accustomed kind of speeches this afternoon. I do not know why, but no one who has followed these discussions, especially in the country, will question the accuracy of my statement when I say that the Government and their supporters have taken a very high moral attitude in regard to this question. Well, in the case of one section of the community—a section which is not very numerous, but which is very much in earnest, and which is so well represented by the hon. Member for the Appleby division—I can understand that attitude, and though I do not admire it I can forgive it. But what about the attitude of others? What about hon. Gentlemen who sit on the Bench opposite who have not put in their Bill a single line that interferes in the smallest degree with their own habits, and who have spent, as the Prime Minister told us this afternoon, six weeks of Parliamentary time with the lightest hearts, in imposing on other people restrictions, not one of which affects themselves? Surely the moral attitude is not very much justified in them. It is equally aggressive. Even the Prime Minister—and I am not going to say anything offensive either in his presence or his absence—who is not naturally adapted to be a leader of saints—that is intended as a compliment—has adopted that rôle. In an address in the country the Prime Minister said that it was proved to demonstration that the Tory Party had no interest in temperance. [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches; "Hear, hear."] Well, I suppose we ought to be grateful to him for putting it in the negative form and not saying that our only interest was in the increase of drunkenness. But the Prime Minister has done better than that. He rose on these lines to the high-water mark at a dinner given in the City—I was on the platform and heard him, and therefore I am justified in referring to it—to one of that large body recently added to the House of Lords, either for the sake of strengthening or weakening it, I am not sure which. On that occasion the guest of the evening—the new peer—in speaking of the Licensing Bill, said—

> "For unmitigated, concentrated, undiluted selfishness, you have to go to the Tory camp."

Speaking of that speech the words of which I have quoted, the Prime Minister said—

> "It was a model to all of us of good taste and good feeling."

Well, all that I mean to say by alluding to these expressions is this, that the Radical Party have placed themselves again, as they have so often done before, on a moral pedestal from which they look down on publicans and sinners in the world below. But, as has been pointed out by a great public writer, the great danger of placing oneself on a pedestal is that one is liable to fall off, and I think I shall show that the Government have suffered from some very nasty falls. I am going to take, as far as I can, the line taken by the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman divided the Bill into two distinct categories. He said that there are two considerations by which we must judge the Bill. The first is to what extent it is a temperance measure, and the second is how does it deal with existing interests. If the Bill is unfair to existing interests, it is no justification to say it is a good temperance measure, and the converse is also true. Let me examine it from both points of view. The right hon. Gentleman went over a long list of subsidiary and minor clauses, many of which are unimportant, and some of which are non-controversial. But take first the point of view of temperance. The Bill is only a temperance measure in reality to the extent to which it is intended to reduce the opportunities for obtaining alcoholic refreshment. Our Bill of 1904 was *pro tanto* a temperance measure of the same kind, though not to the same degree. Yet the party opposite who are clamouring for this Bill, had not a good word to say for our Bill of 1904 as a temperance measure. Why not? I can think of only one reason, and that is that there is one section, very small, but very noisy, which is very much over-represented in this House at the present moment, and which considers that anything which injures the trade is good for temperance and that nothing can be good for temperance which does not ruin the publican. I am willing to admit that too great facilities for obtaining drink increases—in spite of the statistics to the contrary—drunkenness. I admit that the number of public-houses in the country is too great, but the position is the same to-day as at the date of the Peel Commission. I admit that this may be to a certain extent a temperance measure, but I say that the truth is, however, the moment you reduce the opportunities for obtaining drink below the demands, not of the drunkard but of the ordinary community, at that moment your reduction ceases to be a temperance measure in any sense whatever. I happened to read the other day a report made by the directors of a distillery company in America. It was a business and not a political document, and it made the statement, which I believe harmonises with the experience of the world, that prohibition has never diminished but has tended to increase the consumption of liquor. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh," and OPPOSITION cries of "Hear, hear."] If you reduce the open outside facilities beyond a certain point you do not diminish intemperance or the use of alcohol; you simply change the sources of supply. From the open air you drive it underground, and that is what this Bill will do. But there is more than that. The Government assure us that there is some principle in the Bill, and that that principle is that intemperance is to be cured by taking away facilities for the supplying of drink. The Bill, however, does not carry that principle out. It takes away the facilities under most oppressive conditions and in an excessive degree from one of the sources of supply, but it leaves all other sources of supply open altogether. There is no shadow of evidence that the trade you drive out of the public-house will not instantly be transferred to the clubs.

The Government had a nasty fall in regard to off-licences, but with regard to the clubs they have, in my honest opinion, had a fall from their pedestal which leaves them lying in the mire so far as the principle of this Bill is concerned. When my right hon. friend asked the Government, "How do you justify the measure you are dealing out to the clubs with the measure you are dealing out to the publicans?" the answer of the Prime Minister and Under-Secretary to the Home Department was, "We do not propose to put restrictions on the clubs." Do they think that that is an answer? The Prime Minister has taunted us with not having put greater restrictions upon the clubs in the Act of 1904. We do not accept the right hon. Gentleman's principle. We do not consider that intemperance is to be cured by imposing restrictions on the temperate, but that is the Government view, and how can they, with any honesty or consistency, leave the trade which they take away from public-houses to grow up in clubs? If they were really honest they would reduce the number of clubs at whatever cost and prevent them from increasing in precisely the same way as they propose to reduce the number of public-houses. I happened to read the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury on this subject. It was a very moderate speech. I am not going to make any comment on any of the bishops because they do not agree with us on the matter. On the contrary, I say that if a mistake is to be made, and I think that a mistake is being made, I should far rather see the leader of the Church make it by opposing the party to which they ordinarily belong than by opposing a Bill which they really believe is a measure of social reform. I say that without hesitation. I say also that it is a mistake which, in my experience, Gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House have never had to deplore in the militant leaders of some denominations usually friendly to them. The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking on this Bill, said—

> "If I believed that the trade would really go to the clubs then I should not be in favour of the Bill, but I am informed that the Scottish Act of 1903 is a perfect safeguard against that."

I happened to be speaking in my own constituency next day, and I ventured to

Mr. Bonar Law.

say there that the Archbishop was mistaken, and that opinion has since been officially confirmed. I find that Sunday drunkenness has been increasing in Glasgow. The magistrates asked the chief constable to give a report explaining that fact, and he gave in a report. Another report was issued by a sub-committee of the town council, and that report said that—

> "In spite of the precautions it is perfectly easy for clubs to obtain licences for drinking purposes and for nothing else."

Of course the Glasgow magistrates have asked for more restrictions. It is the old story, if you wish to cure intemperance in this way. You ask for restrictions, and you find they will not act, and you come for more and more restrictions until I am sure the universal experience is that the public sense of the community is roused against the whole thing, and they finally abandon it. That is what is going to happen always with attempts of that kind. There were ironical cheers from the Ministerial Benches when Peckham was mentioned. The Prime Minister had said—

> "I would rather suffer fifty defeats than win one victory such as Peckham."

Now, I have made inquiries, and I find there are a large number of political clubs in the borough of Camberwell, of which Peckham forms part, belonging to both political parties. I find that the Conservative and Unionist clubs, without exception, are closed on Sunday. I find that the great majority are Radical clubs, all of which I am sure would, without a moment's hesitation, vote in favour of closing public-houses on Sundays, and that these same clubs are open on Sundays for the supply of liquor to their members, to their members' friends, and to affiliated members, at all hours of Sunday, including a great many hours of Sunday night. I hope we have now heard the last of Peckham, and of the party which does most for temperance and the party which talks about it, or the party which is lessening the temptations to immoderate drinking. If, however, they are not satisfied, I will tell them something more. These clubs are not only Sunday public-houses, but many of them are Sunday music-halls as well. If the Prime Minister wants information as to that fact, he can get it from his colleagues on the Treasury Bench.

AN HON. MEMBER (on the MINISTERIAL Benches): What about Sunday golf?

MR. BONAR LAW: Well, I suppose both the Prime Minister and myself could talk about that also. What I am saying is that these entertainments take place on Sundays. I am not talking about them from the Sabbatarian point at all. It is a great mistake to bring that in. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."] I am talking about them from the point of view of Sunday closing. What happens? The artistes engaged are paid, and how are they paid? They are paid from the funds of the club; and how are these funds obtained? They arise largely from the sale of the drink, from the increased consumption of drink to which their entertainments gives rise. And the party which sanctions and permits that is the party which claims to represent the religious consciences of the people of England. I hope now we have heard the end of Peckham. I believe, personally, for the reasons which I have given, that this Bill from the point of view of temperance will be, if passed to-morrow, a curse and not a blessing to the people. That is my belief; but if I thought that it would be the best of all temperance measures my opposition to it would be precisely the same. [MINISTERIAL ironical laughter.] Hon. Members do not understand me. I say that the two things ought to be kept separate. I maintain that if this country desires a temperance measure it can afford to pay for it honestly. I say that honesty should come before even an attempt at curing intemperance, and I believe that this measure is fundamentally and radically unjust. As to the principles on which compensation has been dealt with, there is a radical difference of view between the two sides of the House on the question of the justice of these proposals which makes any kind of compromise, until one of us gives way, impossible. The Prime Minister said that licences are not a form of property, but we say, not that a licence is a perpetual freehold or anything like it, but that it is a form of property which has just as much right to be respected as if it were a freehold. If I go to the Prime Minister as a beggar and he gives me a penny, I have no ground of complaint, but if I go to him and say he owes me £5, we are on an equal footing, and I have to prove he owes it to me and he has to prove he does not. That is the position here. The proposals for compensation which are made in this Bill are proposals which could never be made if legitimate rights of property were recognised. If they were, the Government would not arbitrarily say, "We give you this or that," they would form an estimate of what that property really was, and, having formed that estimate, they would say how they proposed to deal with it. I believe that this is a form of property as sacred as any other. I believe that there is a legal right of property which this Bill is going to destroy. I am not going to press this point, because, unlike the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley, I believe that lawyers are much more likely to know more about the law than laymen, but I do say, and I will give my reasons, that the judgment which is so much relied upon, that of *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield*, lays down this condition. This was the argument which was pressed home this afternoon, in a way which would have been perfectly irresistible, but which most of the hon. Gentlemen opposite evaded by being outside the House at the time. The legal argument, as I understand it, is this. Under the *Sharpe* v. *Wakefield* decision a licence must not be taken away except judicially and it is impossible to take away the whole of them in accordance with any system. Now, I will put the point in this way, either to the Solicitor-General or any other hon. Gentleman. Is it possible for all the licensing magistrates in England at this moment to bring about the reduction which is contemplated in this Bill under the present law? If the hon. Gentleman says it is, then I leave him to be dealt with by other lawyers. If he says it is not, then they are taking away by this Bill a legal right which cannot be taken away without it. What is it that gives a prescriptive right? For generations the licences have been renewed so regularly that only an infinitesimal fraction of them have been taken away, except for misconduct. More than that, the State, for revenue purposes, has treated this kind of property as if it were not only a property but a freehold property. I know a great deal has been said about a circular letter which has been issued from the Treasury in regard to the instructions under the Act of 1904, as to death duties. That letter was a very curious thing to come from the Chancellor of the Exchequer and it contained two assertions, neither of which was right, and I will only say that I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he uses a Government Department as a branch of the Liberal Publication Department should sign the document himself, and not impose that duty upon a permanent official. Whatever that circular letter may say the fact remains that the principle upon which the death duties are taken has not been changed. It is the same now as it has always been, and if you tell me that they are based on market value, then that brings me to the second prescriptive right which this class of property enjoys. Not only have the licences been regularly renewed, but they have been renewed with the knowledge of the party interested, the State. As Mr. Gladstone said—

> "These rights have grown up not through the fault of the people; they have grown up through our fault, the fault of the State."

They are prescriptive rights. The right hon. Member for Spen Valley puts it this way. He said, "Suppose I was the owner of a property which a tenant had been enjoying from year to year at half its value, and I said to myself, 'I may as well have that money as the tenant,' and I went to the tenant and said to him, 'I am going to take over this property, but I will let you have it for fourteen years longer,' the tenant would say, 'Whittaker, you are a gentleman.'" But that is not the true analogy. Suppose the right hon. Gentleman was the possessor of property which had belonged to his grandfather or great grandfather; suppose, to the knowledge of his predecessors and his own knowledge, the right of occupying that property had been sold over and over again in the open market; and suppose the tenant had just paid a large sum for the right of occupying the property, and that the right hon. Gentleman then said: "I find by the law I can take possession of this property, and in a few years I am going to sell to somebody else"; if I know anything of human nature, the compliment would not be repeated, and the answer would be: "Sir, you are a scoundrel," and it would be the correct answer. ["Oh!"] The right hon. Gentleman knows that I do not mean that personally, I am sure. Now, that is not a fanciful analogy. It is an analogy which has just occurred. Take the position of Ulster "tenant right." That was a yearly renting of the property, and nothing more. Yet the custom had grown up of buying and selling the right to occupy that property. Parliament was then perfectly fair and impartial; it had no interest in the matter. It recognised that that right of property did exist, and it gave it a legal position. Does anybody say that in a case where Parliament is the buyer, in an exactly similar case, the same principles of right and equity are not to apply as applied in the case of the Ulster "tenant right?" I notice whenever the "Coach and Horses" is mentioned there is a sort of objection to it, but I am going to mention it as another illustration of how firmly the idea of property is rooted in the mind of Government officials. It was sold, as everyone admits—I have forgotten the figures, but I think it was for £6,000 more than it would have fetched without a licence. Supposing you were dealing here not between the State and an individual but between two individuals; either the Government did not believe that the Bill was going to pass, or they were utterly unjustified in selling at that price. I say that all these facts which I have given, and many more with which I do not trouble the House, show clearly that there is a right of property, which you are deliberately taking away without adequate compensation. Before I close I would point out one other objection to this Bill, and a very strong one. I am not going to work it out; I am merely going to mention it. I say that as statesmen or even as business men you have no right to create all the disturbance you have created in this trade without seeing exactly what is going to happen at the end of the time-limit. You have created chaos now. The Prime Minister said that at the end of the time-limit the State will get unfettered control of this property; but, judging by what we have heard in Committee, existing licence-holders are still to get some advantage from holding the licence. The real fact is that nobody can say what the position will be at the end of the time-limit, and I repeat that for any body of men calling themselves statesmen to create all this confusion without being certain that they are making one final job is the worst kind of incompetency. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have finished except for my peroration. I do not generally indulge in perorations——

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to read it?

MR. BONAR LAW: Yes. I have been provided with one which is much better than anything I can compose myself, and it is because it deals so adequately with one aspect of our objection to this Bill that I propose to read it. I have not touched upon that aspect, which was raised by the right hon. Gentleman when he said, "This Bill is the will of the Commons of England." It is for that reason I am going to read the peroration—

> "I think the Bill is a bad Bill; but whether it is a good Bill or whether it is a bad Bill, surely it ought to be a sufficient reason for its rejection that, good or bad, it is not the handiwork of the House of Commons. It is to a degree which is wholly unprecedented the exclusive and incorrect composition of the Government and their draftsmen, and this House, in being asked to read this Bill a third time, is being asked to perform, not the functions of a Parliament, but of a registry."

[OPPOSITION cheers.] The cheers ought to have come from the other side of the House, for the words I have quoted are contained in the closing speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite in regard to the Licensing Bill of 1904.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down ended his speech with an allusion to the inadequate discussion we have had on this Bill. I should like to ask him how long he thinks this discussion would have lasted had we had no closure Resolution. A time-limit of fourteen years would itself have been inadequate, and on this day, the 20th of November, we should undoubtedly still have been discussing Clause 1. But, unlike the condition of things when the Bill of 1904 reached its conclusion, we may say, and I think honestly say, that there is not a single important controversial proposition in this Bill which has not been amply discussed, and, if some details have been passed under the closure, the reason for that is patent. The tactics of the Opposition have been very transparent; prolonged discussions, interminable speeches on the Question "that subsection 1 stand part of the clause" or "that the clause stand part of the Bill," these have proceeded day by day and week by week, and methods of procedure have been so devised in order that the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues may make perorations such as that we have just heard. The hon. Member ended his speech with a quotation from a debate on the Third Reading of the Licensing Bill of 1904. I will begin mine with a quotation from the same debate, which, I think, answers most effectively a large part of the arguments he and others have addressed to the House. The hon. Member who has to-day moved the rejection of the Bill said he did not believe there was a tittle of evidence that the reduction of facilities would reduce intemperance. Well, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down has quoted from my leader. I will quote from the hon. Gentleman's. [AN HON. MEMBER: Which?] He was certainly the hon. Member's leader then, as the fiscal controversy had only just emerged on the horizon. The Leader of the Opposition said—

> "When it is seen that by this Bill, and by this Bill alone, you can without gross injustice and discontent really diminish the number of licences in this country, all parties, forgetting the differences which have unhappily divided us for the last three months, will admit that this is the greatest contribution ever made to the cause of temperance reform."

If the licences are reduced at the rate of one thousand a year by a Conservative Act of Parliament, that is a great act of temperance reform; but if they are to be reduced at the rate of two thousand a year by a Liberal Act of Parliament, that is a gross hypocrisy and sham. I have not time—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh!"] I do not complain, because I recognise that the front Opposition bench was entitled to full time to reply to the Prime Minister—I make no complaint of the brevity of the period allowed me—I was only saying that it is obviously impossible for me to follow the hon.

Member over the large field he has traversed, and I will, therefore, deal only with a point to which he seemed to attach the most importance—the question whether or not this is a confiscatory Bill. The hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill was exceedingly emphatic on the point. He said that any one who supports the time-limit and measures of compensation such as are proposed in this measure "falls below the level of a footpad." I cannot help thinking that the hon. Member is very severe on the Bishops. It is rather hard to accuse of a deliberate breach of one of the most important of the Commandments those who are above all others their official defenders. But these high doctrines of absolute property in licences have, I venture to say, in the course of our discussions absolutely collapsed. The hon. Member to-day has, it is true, attempted to revise and to support them. The logical inference from the arguments of the Opposition to-day is that there is absolute property in a licence.

AN HON. MEMBER: In licences.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The hon. Member says if you take away a licence from one house in which a man has invested his whole property it is not confiscation legally understood, and you have a right to do it, but if you deprive three or five houses, or the whole of the houses in a district, or all the houses in the country by a single act of Parliament, that is not merely colloquial—which I presume means Conservative-platform—confiscation, but technical, legal confiscation. The consequence of that doctrine is that any time-limit must be inevitably unjust. [OPPOSITION cheers.] Yes, hon. Members cheer, but the Leader of the Opposition has said he does not hold that doctrine. He has admitted in unmistakable terms that, in his view, if the time-limit was sufficiently long, and if the trade meanwhile was freed from the burdens of compensation levy, a time-limit may not be unjust. I submit that the doctrine of the hon. Member for Dulwich and that of the Leader of the Opposition are absolutely contradictory, and that the Party opposite must be held to be bound by the words of their official leader. The only other point I can make in the time at my disposal is this. The Bill, so far as monopoly value is concerned, laid no undue burden on the trade when it was introduced, but, as amended, has greatly lightened the burden. The seven years extension before the monopoly value is taken means a reduction by two-fifths or nearly half of that burden—and the definition of monopoly value which we have inserted has made clear that the charge will be one of small proportions. The opposition to the Bill is based upon "proputty, proputty, proputty." We are faced to-day by the old issue of wealth against commonwealth. The Government believe that intemperance, next to poverty itself, is the greatest social evil afflicting our country. We are convinced that intemperance is in large degree the product of the opportunities and facilities for intemperance. We know that this Bill will greatly lessen those facilities and opportunities. It is for that reason, in the interests of the people whom we govern and whom we serve, that we so earnestly desire the passage of this Bill.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 350; Noes, 113. (Division List No. 41[illegible].)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, Sir John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Chesh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.

Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras. W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, Sir James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, Sir W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, Sir James
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton

Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S
Herbert T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)

M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murray, Capt Hn A. C. (Kincard.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir J. H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roch, Walter F. (Pembroke)
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)

Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Sir Charles Edw. (Staff'rd)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. de R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. Dundas (Dumbart'nsh.
White, Sir Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn, Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Belloc, Hilaire, Joseph Peter R.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York).
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Oddy, John James
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 23rd November, 1908.

Several Lords took the Oath.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour of: Of Members of the Church of Christ, Waterwork Street, Bootle; Leaders Meeting of the Wesleyan Society, Haltwhistle; Members and Attenders of the Religious Society of Friends in Huddersfield, signing; Members of the Paraclete Congregation Church, Newton Mambles; South Division Wales Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends; Staines and District United Temperance Council; Quarterly Meeting of the Earlestown Grand Division Sons of Temperance; Congregation of Primitive Methodist Church, Hendon Road, Hull; Bethesda United Methodist Church, Leek; Women's Total Abstinence Union; Trinity Baptist Church, Horton Lane, Bradford; A Public Meeting held at the Baptist Schoolroom, Vine Street, Aldershot, 28th October, 1908; Stimpson Avenue Wesleyan Church, Northampton; Members of the Upper Chapel Unitarian Congregation, Sheffield, signing, and others; Oldham and District Band of Hope and Temperance Union; Council and Members of the Glasgow United Young Men's Christian Association (Temperance Section); Temperance Committee, South Wales District, Primitive Methodist Connexion; Society of Friends in the District of Moseley Road, Birmingham; A Public Meeting held in the Congregational Schoolroom at Mere, Wilts; A Meeting in connection with "Clapton Park" Congregational Church, London, N.E., held on 19th October, 1908; South Norwood P.S.A. Brotherhood; The Brentwood P.S.A. Brotherhood; The Inhabitants of Enfield at a Public Meeting 14th October, 1908; National Commercial Temperance League (Leicester Branch); Erdington Temperance Association; Sheffield Women's Christian Temperance Association; Evangelical Church Council of Kidderminster and District; Hoyland Primitive Methodist Circuit Temperance Union; Church of Christ Band of Hope, Thatto Heath, St. Helens, Lancashire; Members of the Guild of Fellowship in connection with Attercliffe Unitarian School Church; Sunday School Teachers and Elder Scholars of Upper Chapel, Sheffield; United Council of Sheffield and District Women's Liberal Associations; United Free Church of Scotland, Presbytery of Perth; Wesley Guild, Haltwhistle; Liskeard Temperance Society; Oldham and District Band of Hope Temperance Union; South Woodford Branch of British Women; Attercliffe Branch of Sheffield Women's Christian Temperance Association; Meetings of the Primitive Methodist Church at Selly Oak and Bowenbrook, 1st November, 1908; Public Meeting held at Patricroft on 12th October, 1908; Great Western Railway Temperance Union (Aberdare Branch); Public Meeting of the Members of the United Methodist Church, Molesworth Street, Rochdale; Congregation of the Calvinistic Methodist Church, Pwllheli, Carnarvonshire; Officers, etc., of the Wesleyan Church, Coventry Road, Birmingham; Congregation of the Oakdale Presbyterian Mission, Seacombe, Cheshire; Skye Presbytery of the United Free Church of Scotland; Ministers and Deacons of the Calvinistic Methodists of South Cardiganshire; Congregation of the Ainon Baptist Chapel, Abertyssiog, Monmouth; International Order of Good Templars, Perseverance Lodge, No. 2706; Coleridge Lodge, No. 4523; Swallowfield Lodge, Reading; Littlehampton Branch; Public Meeting in the Wesleyan Chapel, Littleborough, 3rd November, 1908; Public Meeting held at Hampstead Norris, near Newbury; Brunswick Welsh Wesleyan Church, Rhyl; Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town of Sandown; Public Meeting held at Bolingey, in the County of Cornwall; Scholars attending the Greet Early Morning Adult School, Birmingham; Executive Officers of the St. John Street Welsh Temperance Society, Chester; Branch of the Original Order of the Total Abstinent Sons of The Phœnix, Seacombe, Cheshire (Bond of Union Lodge, No. 212); Congregation of the United Methodist Church, Haddington Road, Devonport; Temperance Meeting at Mexborough; The following

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Branches of the British Women's Temperance Association; Sheringham, Truro, Ashton-under-Lyne, Cockermouth, Tunbridge Wells, Holbeck and New Wortley; The Low Bentham Unsectarian Band of Hope; Kirkcaldy Presbytery of the United Free Church of Scotland; Members of the Baptist Church, Astley Bridge, Bolton; Primitive Methodist Church, New Southgate, Enfield Circuit; Welsh Congregational Church, Martin's Lane, Liscard, Cheshire; River Street Women's Early Morning School, Birmingham; Independent Order of Good Templars (Llanelly Welsh District); Zion United Methodist Sunday School, Batley; Primitive Methodist Church, Bushill Park, Edmonton; Primitive Methodist Church of Goff's Oak, Cheshunt, Herts; Primitive Methodist Church, Enfield Lock; Primitive Methodist Church, Chase Side, Enfield; Harrow and District Free Church Council; Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of Beeston in the County of Notts; Jerusalem Presbyterian Church, Abertyssiog, Monmouth; Primitive Methodist Church of Lye; Friends' Adult School, Rawdon; Public Meeting held in the Wesleyan Schools, St. Helens, on 11th November, 1908; Rotherham and District Sunday School Band of Hope Union; Public Meeting at Bacup; Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of Beaumaris; Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of Southport; Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of Woodbridge: Independent Order of Rechabites (Falmouth) (Safe Anchorage Tent, No. 2,185); Kent and Sussex Baptist Association (Sussex District); Of a Public Meeting at Earby; The Parishioners of the Parish Church, King's Heath; The People's Bible Class, Birmingham; Primitive Methodist Church, Birmingham; River Street Women's School, Birmingham; Miss S. Dobbins, Summer Lane, Birmingham; British Women's Temperance Association, Ossett; Audience at Ebenezer Hall, Everton; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Cwm; Worshippers at St. Domingo Hall, Everton; Welsh Wesleyan Church, Rhyl; Inhabitants of Beeston Edge End Church, Sydbrook Circuit; Watson Street Men's Meeting, Plaistow; Primitive Methodists Church, Hedgefield; Fidelity Tent, No. 146, of the Independent Society of Rechabites, Crawford; Public Meeting at Craven Arms, Salop; York and District Band of Hope Union; Watson Street Mission Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, Plaistow; Guardian Eagle Tent, No. 1,663, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Falkirk; Ivy Tent, No. 2,841, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Mapplewell; Advance Tent, No. 1,102, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Thornhill Edge; Dyfodel Ein Gwlad, Tent, No. 1,921, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Troedyrhin; Blodenyn Yr Yynys Tent, No. 2,009, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Yynshir; Royal Oak Tent of the Independent Order of Rechabites; High Peak Tent, No. 78, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Peak Dale; Jubilee Tent, No. 1,785, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Vigilant Tent, No. 1,198, of the Independent Order of Rechabites, Cleckheaton; Quarterly Conference of Temperance Reformers, Pendlebury; London Sons of Temperance Friendly Society; Temperance Committee of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Denomination; Truro Branch of the British Women's Temperance Association; Church of Christ, Bootle; Citizens of East Grinstead; Welsh Congregational Church, Birmingham; British Women's Temperance Society, Grimsby; British Women's Temperance Association, Leicester; Advance Guard, 1884 Tent, of the International Order of Good Templars; British Women's Temperance Association, Winsford; Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church, Birmingham; Nonconformists Ministers Fraternal Meeting, St. Helens; Duke Street United Methodist Church, Southport; Heckmondwike Temperance Society; Jerusalem Welsh Methodist Church, Ynysybwl; Lodge No. 1, St. John's of the Red Cross Knights; Seacombe Presbyterian Church; Trustees of the Prescot Wesleyan Methodists Church; Presbytery of Hawick of the United Free Church of Scotland; Primitive Methodist Church, Ladywood; "Hope of Bearwood" Lodge of Good Templars, Smethwick; People's Bible Class, Birmingham; United Methodist Mission, Derby; Seacombe Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Meeting; Leagram's Tent, No. 3,371, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; United Free Presbytery of Ardrossan; Parishioners of Parish Church, King's

Heath; "Veto" Tent, No. 2,534, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Wesleyan Methodists Church, Clawton; County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire; British Women's Temperance Association, Handsworth; Baptist Church, Ripley; Hay Mills Congregational Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Meeting, Birmingham; Ministers and Officials of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in the Ilkley Circuit; Wisbech and District Free Church Council; Independent Methodist Temperance Society, Bingham; Martock Lodge, No. 4,623, of the International Order of Good Templars; Bright Hope of the Future Tent, No. 1,374, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Good Intent Tent, No. 203, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Vale Royal Safeguard Tent, No. 1,510, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Ark of Safety Tent, No. 1,349, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Hope of Lostock Tent, No. 1,862, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Blaguryn Goluithiol Tent, No. 1,808, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Gwiullan Tent, No. 2,211, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Dyfodol Dar Tent, No. 2,616, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Gobaith yr Ynys Tent, No. 1,825, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Gogonant Llanfabon Tent, No. 2036, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Blodewyn Dirwest Tent, No. 1,959, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Dyfodol Ein Gwlad Tent, No. 1,921, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Tent, No. 2,126, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Baner Sobrwydd Tent, No. 2,218, of the Indedependent Order of Rechabites; Gobaith Cynon Tent, No. 2,061, of the Independent Order of Rechabites; Calvinistic Methodist Church, Pandy Tudur, Llanrwst; Total Abstinent Sons of the Phœnix Friendly Society, Bilston; South Woodford Branch of British Women's Temperance Association; Brixton Hill Men's Meeting; Branches of the National British Women's Temperance Association at Sheriff Hutton, Toxteth (Liverpool), Poringland (Norwich), Waterloo and Blundellsands, Tollington Park and Hornsey, Highbury, Woodhall Spa, Eccleshill, (Bradford), Ashton-under-Lyne, Hayling Island, Rushden, Sleaford, Sunderland, Heath (Cardiff), Bilston, Runcorn, Manchester Road, Tottenham, Truro, Southend, Chingford, Arboretum, Penarth, Stockport, Keighley, Eccles, Maidstone, Mickley, Wingrove, Felton, Retford, Walton, Blackheath, Amble, Goxhill, West Finchley, Bedminster, Teams, Gateshead, Swansea, New Southgate and Friern Barnet, York, Hafod, Hales Owen, Wallasey, Willesden, Winchester, Upminster, Blandford, Burgess Hill, Ditchling, Hassocks, Daventry, Coalville, Aintree, Enfield, Harringay and West Green, Bowes Park and Wood Green (five Branches), Darlington, Leicester, Langley Mill, Heswall, Weardale, St. Albans, Eastside, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lincoln, Bishopston, Flamborough, Shipley, Cleckheaton, Manor Park, Brynmawr, Fairfield, Bentham, Staincliffe, Wooton Bassett, Wood Green, Hebden Bridge, Blackburn, Isleworth, Higham Ferrers, Liverpool Centre, Birkenhead, Bridlington, Clydach (Glamorganshire) Littlehampton, Blyth, Camberwell, Tilehurst, Buxton, Highbury Park, Crouch Hill, Swavesey, Adderbury East, Eastbourne, Malton, Walkden, Mexborough, Hyde, Brighton, Yeadon, Grimsby, Redhill, Benwell, Loddon, Ripley, West Bromwich, Durham City, Willington Quay, Peak Dale and District, Glossop, Southfields, Dawley, Walsall, Lutterworth, Twickenham, Stoke and Trent Vale, West Jesmond, Wallasey Village, Harrow, Preston (Brighton), Stourport, Abertillery, Treforest, Hungerford, Anerley and Penge, Leytonstone, Roundhay, Chesterfield, Letchworth, Audley and Halmerend, Bentinck (Newcastle-on-Tyne), Palmer's Green, Roseville Road (Leeds), Leominster, Folkestone, Bow and Bromley (E.), Carlisle, Westmoor and Forest Hall, Catford, St. Day, Irthlingborough, Scotland Road (Liverpool), Bitterne Park, Neath, Allerton (Bradford), Shieldfield (Newcastle-on-Tyne), Waverley Park, Winsford (Cheshire), Kettering, Chiswick, Plymouth, and Stonehouse, Marsden (Huddersfield), Huntingdon, Old Southgate, Accrington, Colwyn Bay, Clevedon, East Ham and Upton Park, East Croydon, Kirkdale, Headingley (Leeds), Constitution Hill (Birmingham), Bootle (Lancashire), Norwich, Aberdare, Prittlewell, Canterbury, Scotswood-on-Tyne, Saffron Walden, Woolstanton (Staffordshire), Ingleton, Hailsham, Brackley, Skegness, Basingstoke, Halton and Crossgates, St. Anne's-on-Sea, Gateshead, Cadoxton, Manselton (Swansea), Greenwich, Gosforth, Long Melford, Tonbridge, Helmsley, Barton-on-Humber, Leyton, Herne Bay, Harringay and West Green, Chesham, Altrincham and Bowdon, New Holland (Lincolnshire), Malvern Cambridgeshire Scattered Members, Canton (Cardiff), Welburn (York), Aspatria, Honiton, Stourbridge, Bowes Park, (North London), West Kirby, Exmouth, Muswell Hill, Great Yarmouth, Street (Somersetshire), Swinton and Pendlebury, Mapperley (Nottinghamshire), Lower Edmonton, Astwood Bank, Whitby, Farm Street (Birmingham), Cleethorpes, Seaton Delaval, Wimbledon (No. 2), Sherwood and Carrington, Hornchurch, Upper Norwood, Hylton, Ilkley, Barnet, Carley Street (Leicester), Crosby (Liverpool), Wrexham, Scarborough, Goole, Liskeard, Saltley New Brighton, Launceston, Blundellsands and Waterloo "Y", Shipley, Nottingham County Union, Finsbury Park, South Hayling, Sidcup, Weymouth, Wigton, Great Bridge (Tipton), Hither Green, Rayleigh, Tulse Hill and West Norwood, Howden-le-Wear and Beechburn, Burnley, Coneysthorpe, Gorleston, Sutton-in-Ashfield (Nottinghamshire), Newport (Pembrokeshire), Lancaster, Swindon, Wallington, West Walthamstow, Wingrove, Thatcham, Tranmere, Four Oaks and Hill, North Shields, Kentish Town, Forest Gate, Upminster, Cross Street Baptist Church, Wimborne, Thirsk, Olney, Hove, Sutton, Pocklington, Abercarn, Tulse Hill and West Norwood, Salisbury, Hammersmith, Louth, Sittingbourne, Stalybridge, Highgate, Purton, Wiltshire, Morecambe, Pontypridd, Earlestown, Barry Dock, Whitley Bay, Hasland (Chesterfield), Guiseley, Bedford, Tipton, Wimbledon, North Finchley and Whetstone, Streatham and Balham, Bideford, Ripon, Ackworth, Manningtree, Cowes, Stratford and West Ham, Newbury, Winlayton, Cleator Moor, Batley, Thrapston, Stockton-on-Tees, Barrow-on-Humber, Barnsley, Woking, Wallingford, Annelrey and Penge, Measham, Barbican, Boreham Wood and Elstree, Portsmouth, Kirkby Stephen, Cilfynydd, Barnsbury, Bishop Auckland, Gloucester, East Dulwich, Raunds, Bedale, Dudley, Holloway, Newbridge, Birstall, Selly Oak (Birmingham), Bolsover, Hyson Green, Burley (Leeds), Leek, Pudsey, Burslem, Low Fell, Thorne, Minehead, Bristol, Havant, Chatteris, Newport (Isle of Wight), Barry, Knottingley, Hessle, Boston, Bath, Middleton, Rockferry, Reading, Oldham, Lydney, Clapton, Woodstock, Cheltenham, Cambridge Heath and London Fields, Stoke Newington, Rotherham, Richmond (Surrey), Woodhouse (Leeds), Rectory Road (Clapton), Paddington, Kilburn, and St. John's Wood, Reigate, Carr's Hill (Gateshead), Ystalyfera, Rochdale, West Bridgford, Totnes, Romford, Woodford Green, Ipswich, Cambridge, Devonshire Square (Stoke Newington), Filey, Frances Willard (Leyton), Wednesbury, Marple, East Ardsley (Yorkshire), Sutton Coldfield and Erdington, Morley, Horsforth (Leeds), Seaforth, Brondesbury Mothers Meeting, Low Moor, Plymouth, Morning Lane Working Women's, Selby, West Bowling, Lady Lane (Leeds) Central Mission, Heanor, Southport, Rye, Wavertree, Tyne Dock (South Shields), Wibsey (Bradford), Clitheroe, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Victoria Hall Branch (East Greenwich), South Shields, Woodborough Road (Nottingham), Bishopston "Y", Mundesley-on-Sea, Penzance, Nevagissey, Redruth, Claremont Hall, North, Falmouth, Liverpool, West Toxteth, Wadebridge, Saltash, Islington, Derby, Hastings, Seaford, Christchurch (Westminster Bridge Road), Wakefield, Stocksfield, Hope Street "Y", (Liverpool), Shrewsbury, Devonport, Port Sunlight, Neston (Cheshire), Preston Park, Small Heath, Edgbaston "Y," Great Yarmouth "Y," Canton (Cardiff), Greet, Grafton, Lenton; of the following branches of the Young British Women's Temperance Association at Short Heath, Norwich, Islington, West Bridgford, Birkenhead (Oxton), Fulham, Wood Green, West Hull, Sutton Coldfields and Erdington, Bilston, Longton, Burnley, Newcastle-on-Tyne (Jesmond), Workington, Winsford, Warrington, Dawley, Rochdale, Ripley (Derbyshire), Tunbridge Wells, Tranmere, Kingston-on-Thames, Bedford, Marple (Cheshire), Heckmondwike, Coventry, Reigate, Darlington, Pudsey, Wallington, Croydon, Cockermouth, West Bowling, Muswell Hill, Bowes Park, Horley, Hornsey, Finsbury Park, Canton (Cardiff); of the following County Unions of the British Women's Temperance

Association at Staffordshire, Sussex, Hertfordshire, South Metropolitan Union, Cornwall County, Cumberland and Westmoreland, Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, Berkshire County Union, Hertfordshire County Union, Worcestershire and Herefordshire, Lincoln County Union, Birmingham, Warwickshire and District Union, North Metropolitan Union, Lancashire; of the following Branches of the Women's Christian Temperance Association, Oxford Road, Dock Mission, Heaton Moor, Ravencroft, Withington, Longsight, Oldham Road, Salem, Collyhurst, South Reddish "Y," Ladybarn, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Levenshulme "Y," Droylsdon, Ardwick, Greenhill Street (Greenhays), Withington "Y," Whalley Range, Higher Openshaw, Miles Platting, Radnor Street, Regent Road, Salford, Cheetham Hill and Crumpsall, Dolphin Street, Broughton, Manchester Girl's Institute, Lower Chatham Street, Manchester and Salford; of the following Branches of the Women's Total Abstinence Union at Ushaw Moor, Bromley and Shortlands (2), Bristol, East, Society of the, Crawley, Huddersfield, Slough, Slough Junior, Brislington, Leytonstone, Exeter, Kelvedon, Hayward's Heath, Enfield, Langley Park (County Durham) Junior Society, Bromley and Shortlands Executive Committee, Chelmsford, Clapton and Stamford Hill, Young Women's Social, Meopham, Streatham and Tulse Hill; of the following Branches of the British Women's Temperance Association at Consett and Blackhill: Mickley, Wingrove, Felton, Retford; of the following Tents of the Independent Order of Rechabites at Leadhills, Salford Unity, Airdrie, Falkirk, Glasgow, Govan, Skinflats, Whitewick, Blantyre, Carron, Glasgow, Oban, Budleigh Salterton, Lisburn, Maddiston, Lennoxtown, Thorniewood, Carlukes, Shotts, Bonnybridge, Wisham, New Tredegar, Dorchester, Belfast, Glasgow, Dalserf, Kames, Shillingstone (Dorsetshire), Fort William, Bothwell, Law, South Hiendly, Cawthorne, Birdwell, Harley (Rotherham), St. Wakering, Chelmsford, Saffron Walden, Stirling, Dumbarton, Stirling, Lanark, Stirlingshire, Chayston, Kirkintilloch, Blackburn, Moretonhampstead, Exmouth, Horton, Fauldhouse, Shotts, Balluchulish, Partick, Kippen, Motherwell, Lesmahagow, Douglas, Larbert, Coatbridge, Paisley, Glenboig, Ellenabeich, Glasgow, Brentwood, Woodham Ferris, Stonehouse, Ringwood, Boscombe, Hampshire, Langham, Gosport, Crossford, Glasgow, Golbarne, Helsingham, Belfast, Cowie, Old Kilpatrick, Waterside, Stirling Larne, Belfast (2), Canterbury, Standburn, Hillside, Motherwell, Overtown, Avonbridge, Haggs, Belfast, Glasgow, Canterbury (2), Houston, Alloa, Bridge of Weir, Elderslie, Govan, Mexborough, Warrington, Garswood, Haydock, Newtownards, Ballymena, Cambuslang, Douglas Water, Stockholm Heath, Kilmalcolm, Renton, Strathaven, Clackmannan, Glasgow, Hamilton, Maryhill, Kilsyth, Liverpool (2), Chesterfield, Leeds; Of the following Bands of Hope, Baptist, Langley Mill, Wesleyan, Thurgoland, Sheffield, Chapeltown and District, Nelson and District, Canterbury (6), Doncaster, Huddersfield and District, Dewsbury and District, Bishop Auckland and District, Bristol, Derby (2), Colne (2), Cardiff and District, Long Eaton, Northamptonshire, Bolton (10), Bootle, Manningtree, Beverley, Yorkshire; Of the United Kingdom Railway Temperance Union at Sheffield; Of the following Sunday Schools, Congregational, Sheffield (2), Primitive Methodist, Bromley, Kent, Wesleyan, Liskeard, Unitarian, Colne, Wesleyan, Trawdon, Derby and District, Baptist, Osmaston, Derby, St. Mary's Gate, Derby, Rutland Street, Derby, Primitive Methodist, Oakhurst, Batley, Wesleyan, St. Helen's Road, Bolton, Presbyterian, Canterbury, Hanover, Bolton, Northampton (2), Bolton (11), Holland Street, Blackfriars, S.E., Kent Street, Tabard Street, S.E., Wesleyan Methodist, Bootle, Lancashire, Christian Workers, Christchurch, Liscard, Cheshire; Of the following Wesley Guilds at Hull, Worcester, Northampton (5), Bristol (2), Marske-by-Sea, Yorkshire, Bootle, Cardiff, Bourne, Lincolnshire, Young People's Guild, Leeds; Of the following Christian Endeavour Societies: United Methodist Christian, Sheffield (2), Masbro', Rotherham, Chester, Northampton (8), Derby, Bristol, Canterbury, Hull, Christchurch, Westminster Bridge Road, Kingsthorpe; Of the following Young People's Christian Endeavour Societies at Doddridge Church Northampton (4), Boulevard Baptist, Hull (2); Of the following Temperance

Societies and Unions, Temperance Festival Association, West Sleekburn and Stakeford, United Kingdom Railway, Barnard Castle, Stockton-on-Tees, Ladies, Liverpool, Gospel Blue Ribbon Mission, Derby, Temperance Workers, Derby, Women's United, Ealing, United Working Men's, Leeds, Adult School, Worcester, United, Carshalton and Wallington, The Temperance Societies, Longton, Staffordshire, The Queen's Road, Wallington, Lowesmoor, Worcester, Total Abstinence Society, Worcester, Old Baptist Church, Broseley, Salop, Dewsbury, Bishop Auckland, Unitarian, Liverpool, Bridlington, Clifton, Bristol, South Nutfield, Liskeard, Baptist, Peckham, Chignal, Chelmsford, Tredrizzick, Temperance Council, Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, Bolton, Wesleyan Methodist, Linacre, Northamptonshire, St. Andrews Presbyterian Temperance Guilds, Canterbury Lytchett Minster; Of the following Divisions of the Sons of Temperance at Hauxley, Cardiff, Derby, Goole, Earlestown, Bolton; Church of England Temperance Society, Lillingstone Lovell; Of the following Lodges of the International Order of Good Templars at Northern Light Lodge, Newcastle-on-Tyne (3), Hebburn, Leasingthorne, Washington, Leeds, Chesterfield (2), Colne, Northampton (5), Bristol, Southport, Kingsthorpe, Weedon, Bolton, Warrington, St. Helen's, Newton-le-Willows, Oxford; Public Meetings at Great Ayton, Stockton-on-Tees, Rotherham, Prudhoe-on-Tyne, Bromley, Sheffield, Carshalton, Camberwell, Misterton, Stockport, Derby, Brampton, Skegness, Woodhall Spa, Thorpe-on-the-Hill, Coseley, Leicester, Gainsborough, Retford, Fenny Stratford, Pucklechurch, Bristol (15), Keynsham, Wigan, Southampton, Swansea, Market Harborough, Hull, Lincoln, Sawbridgeworth, Little Hallingbury, Fernhill Heath, Worcester, Middlewick, Crediton, Spridlington, Bardney, Sleaford, Navenby, Billinghay, Duston, Ministerley, Kirkdale, Liverpool (9), Glazebury, Great Shelford, Cherryhinton, Peckham Rye, Oxford (5), Dawley, Golborne, Stoke-on-Trent, Birkenhead (2), Prescot, Crewe, Luton, Sparkbrook, Birmingham, Broomfield, Bolton, Cheslyn Hay, Chorley, Newbury, Chesham, Havelock Hall, W.C., Darlington, Everton (2), Seaforth, Hanley Castle, Birkenshaw, New Ferry, Cleckheaton, Birstall, Armley, Belvedere, Crediton; Church of Christ at Parton, Heanor, Derbyshire, Birmingham (3), Bradford, Barrow-in-Furness, Whitehaven, Swindon, Knaphill, Woking, Harrogate, Southfields, S.W., Doncaster, Mapplewell, Barnsley, Dalton-in-Furness, Bourneville, Hull, Leeds, Birkenhead, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Leigh, Lancashire, Leicester St. Helens, Birstall, United Methodist Churches at Stockton-on-Tees, Middlesborough, Leeds, Ilkeston, Derby, Colne (2), Hayland Common, Shiney Row; Primitives Methodists of Tudhoe Colliery, Bedminster, Derby, Sheffield, Methodist New Connexion of Wallsend-on-Tyne; Welsh Congregational Churches at Chester, Birkenhead (2), Liverpool; Congregationalists of North Finchley (2), Exmouth, Hassocks, Whetstone, Halifax, Huddersfield, Leeds, Seacombe, Chester, Balham, Ferndown, Liverpool (2), Ainsdale, Southport (2), Orrell, Upways, Puddletown, Shaftesbury, Bristol, Northampton, Dorchester, Leeds, Melbourne, Derby, London, Sheffield, Bere Regis, Blandford, Morely, Barmouth, Canterbury, Poole, Bolton (2), Hastings, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Northampton (3), Beaminster, Buckley, Cerne Abbas; Committee of Friargate Chapel, Derby; King Street Free Church, Maidstone; Norchcliffe Chapel, Styal; Ancient Chapel and Hope Street Church, Liverpool (2); Christ Church Reformed Episcopal and Memorial Church, Liscard (2); Unity Chapel, Bristol; Brightmet Free Church and St. George's Road Church, Bolton (2); New Road Chapel, Oxford; Melbourne Hall Church, Leicester; Kettering Road Church, Northampton; Unitarian Free Church, West Kirby; Welsh Presbyterian Congregation, Liverpool; English Presbyterian Churches, Chester, New Brighton, Niston, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Canterbury, Free Church Councils of Worcester, Halifax, Yeadon, Coggleshall, East Lancashire, Worksop, Wem, Shropshire, Hull, Bromley, Beckenham, South Bank, Canterbury; Provincial Assembly of Non-Subscribing Ministers and London and South-Eastern Counties Mothers' Meetings at Alvaston, near Derby, Bromley, Kent; Wesleyan Women's Bible Classes, East Bristol, Bromley, Kent (2); Women's Societies at Mothers' Meeting at Bromley (4), Bristol, East, Benwell, Derby; Women's Adult Schools at Leeds, Plymouth, Westbury Brotherhood; Pleasant Sunday Afternoon, New Barnet, Northampton, Hastings, Oxford, North Shields; Mothers' Meeting at Cleckheaton, Homerton; Men's Adult School, Batley; Baptist Men's Own, Leeds; Primitive Methodist Adult Bible Class, Armly; Adult School, Leeds (2); Adult Bible Class, Yorkshire Federation; Adult Schools, Halifax, Marsden, Bradford (2); Men's Meeting, Beeston Hill; Adult School, Hartshead Moor, Headingley; Men's Meeting, North Finchley, Great Boughton; Bible Classes, Derby (7), Northampton, Sheffield, Mickleover, Hayland Common; Wesleyan Class Meeting, Liscard; Brotherhoods, Battersea, Oxford; Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, Everton, Bootle, Bellingham; Men's Brotherhood, Bromley Common; Central Hall Men's Own, Bromley; Friends' Adult School, Horfield; Christians' Meeting House, Netherfield; Religious Society of Friends, Stockport, Cardiff; Baptist Church, Northampton; Classes at Northampton (5), Peckham, Leeds, Liverpool, Liscard (2), Church of Christ, Sheffield, Morley, Askam, Southborough, Nottingham, Dewsbury, Hinckley, South Shields, Leyton, N.E., Ulverston, Liverpool, Wigan, Heanor, Huddersfield, Southport, Leicester, South Wigston, Sheffield, Hindley, Brighton, Blackburn, Uckfield, Altrincham, Percy Main, Northumberland, Birkenhead, Great Saughall, Southport; Welsh Baptist Churches, Liverpool (3); Baptist Churches, North Finchley, Chorley, Hemel Hempstead, Wigan, Birkenhead (4), Bootle-cum-Linacre, Westminster Bridge Road, S.E., Liverpool (2), Claremont, Bolton, Gillingham, Canterbury, Halifax, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Hastings, West Haddon, Blisworth, Weedon, Earl's Barton, Northampton (2), Harpole, Bristol (2), Dover, Chester, Melbourne, Derby (3), Colne, Rye Lane, Peckham, S.E., Sheffield and District; Baptist Associations of Shropshire, Kent, Sussex, Wesleyan Society and Congregation, Stenson; Churches, Mickleover, Newcastle-on-Tyne (3); Wesleyan Methodist Churches, Ushaw Moor, Alvastone, Northampton (2), Kislingbury, Wooton, New Holland, Barton-on-Humber, Tonge Moor, Bolton, Roade, Wallingford Wesleyan Methodist Church, Egremont (4), Liverpool; Wesleyan Churches, Plymouth, Childrey, Crowthorne, Northampton (3), New Brighton, St. Leonard's-on-Sea (2), Hastings, Bootle, Liverpool, Bolton, Oxford, Nestory, Birkenhead; Society of Friends, Kelvedon, Northampton, Halifax; Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Churches, Liverpool (3), Rockferry, Bootle, Birkenhead; Independent Methodist Churches (Band of Hope), Bolton (4), Bradford Moor; Primitive Methodists, Aintree, Liverpool (2), Bolton (2), Swanscombe, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Northampton (2); United Methodists, Liverpool (2), Forest Hill, S.E., Bolton (2), Leicester, Bleadney, Halifax (2), Gildersome, Huddersfield, Middlesborough, Haverton Hill, Leeds, Independent Order of Rechabites from the following Tents: Nodfa Glyd, Rose, Blodewyn Yr Ynys, Castell Cariad, Seren Bethlehem, Sons of Toil, Mid Glamorganshire District, Alpha of Monmouthshire, Pride of Cwm; English Wesleyan Sunday School, Pontardawe; Ffestiniog and Langranog Temperance Societies; Church of Christ, Cwmaman; Zion English Baptist Church, Ynysybwl; English Wesleyan Churches, Pontardawe, Ynysybwl; Moriah Welsh Calvinistic Church, Cefn-Coed; Jerusalem Welsh Methodist Church and Bethel Welsh Calvinistic Church, Ynysybwl; Bethania Welsh Congregational Church, Abercynon; English Congregational Churches at Ynysybwl, Corwen, Old Colwyn, Gwersyllt; Welsh Congregational Churches of Gellideg, Bryn Seion, Ynysybwl, Cwmdare, Merthyr Vale, Nelson, Godseaman, Penegoes, Oswestry, Llanwyddyn, Hansaintffraid, Llanbrynmain, Llanidloes, Penytontawr, Aberhosan, Carno, Penarth, Llanfair (4), Hanwnog, Sammah, Cemmet Road, Llanerfyl, Voerl, Penygroes, Llanselin, Ceidio, Morfa Nivin, Hanrhaeadi, Cardiff (5), Newtown, Merthyr Tydfil, Fourcrossis, Penlan, Horeb Llwydcoed, Nefyn, Groeslon, Rhaslan, Llanystumdwy, Carmel, Portmadoc, Borth-y-Gist, Morfa Byschan, Nazareth, Penrhyndendraith, Criccieth, Talybont, Nebo, Abernant, Bedlinog, Calfaria, Ffinnegroew, Rossett, Johnstown, Shotton, Rhosrobin, Wrexham, Ferndale, Dowlais, Ruabon; Association of Welsh Congregational Churches, North Glamorganshire; Presbyterian

Churches, Groeslwyd, Coedway, Newtown, Llanymymech, Machynlleth, Newport Road, Cardiff, Carlisle Street, Cardiff; Congregational Churches, Cefn Coed (2), Hebron, Bryneraes, Pwllheli, Ystradgynlais; Public Meeting, Taffs Well and District; Methodist Church, Rhiwlay; Congregational Churches, Maengwrynedd, Bwlchyffridd, Bethel, Newtown, Meiford, Braichywaen, Llanfyllin, Cwmnantymeichiaid, Calvinistic Methodist Church, Saron Forge, Llansilin, Llawrycwm, Trefnannan, Gwern-y-pant, Cemmaes, Caersws, Meiford, Bontnewydd, Pentrefelin, Carneddaer, Derwenlas, Aberangell, Llanwrin, Mallwydd, Llanfihangel, Pontrobert, Darowen, Rhydyfelin, New Mills, Hanwrin, Delanog, Llansantffraid, Llanfechain, Pontyperthog, Maesgwyn, Llanbryn, Llanidloes, Park, Llanrharder, Trefeglwys, Llamryglyn, Glaig, Pentyrch, Bethlehem, Soar, Llanfair, Rhydwen, Machynlleth, Carno, Llanrhaiadr, Maengwynedd, Llangynog, Cardiff (3), Capel Uchaf; Methodist Church, Cefn Canol, Horeb, Dolanog, Llangadfan, Adfa, Tregynon, Nenadd, Manledd, Capel Isaf, Deildref, Llanwyddvn; Wesleyan Methodist Church, Cardiff; Congregational Church, Aberangell; Calvinistic Methodist Church, Abermwle; Baptist Church, Cefn Coed, Llanfyllin (2), Caersws, Kerry, Llanidloes, Llanllygan, Llanfair, Machynlleth, Llanrhaidr, Rumney, Cardiff (7); Unitarian Church, Cefn Coed; Welsh Wesleyan Church, Llandiloes (2), Machynlleth, Deep Cutting Penygarnedd, Rumney,; Wesleyan and Calvinistic Methodist Churches, Penygroes; Wesleyan Methodist Churches, Llanfyllin, Llanfechain; Methodist Church, Hirnant; Wesleyan Churches, Llansantffraid, Llanrhaiadr; United Methodist Mission, Cardiff; Three Nonconformist Churches, Birchgrove; United Kingdom Alliance, South Wales; United Methodist Church, Primitive Methodist Church, and Forward Movement Church, Cardiff; Independent Order of Rechabites, Hove of the Valley Tent, Merthyr Vale, Congregational Churches, Drwsycoed, Llaniestyn, Aberbeeg, Craigberthlwyd; Church of Christ, Merthyr Vale, Barry Dock, Llanfair Caerimcoir; Of the following Wesleyan Churches, Milbury Heath, Gloucester, Earthcote Green, Gloucester, Derby, Amberley, Potterne, Wiltshire, Shebbear, Holsworthy Circuit, Thornbury, Trawden, Cowling; Of the following Primitive Methodist Churches, Alveston, Wenlock Road, South Shields, Spondon, Derbyshire, Whaddon; Of the following United Methodist Churches, Redwick, Laygate Lane, South Shields (2), Bude, Colne; Of the following Independent Methodist Churches, Boldon Colliery, South Shields, Pilning, Littleton-on-Severn; Unitarian Church, Colne; Inghamite Church, Colne; Cambringe Hall Congregation, South Shields; St. Simon's Church, Simonside, South Shields; United Methodist, Carden Street, Derby; Town Mission, Traffic Street, Derby; Mission Workers, Percy Street, South Shields; Mission Church, Stone; Independent Chapel, Falfield; Of the following Churches and Congregations, Tockington, Redwick, Olveston, East Compton, Olbury-on-Severn; Society of Friends, Street, Somerset; Free Church Ministers, South Shields; Wesleyan Circuit (8 congregations), Colne; Of the following Free Church Councils, Street, Somerset, Gillingham and District, Weston-super-Mare and District, Calne, Wiltshire, Purton, Wiltshire, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Desborough; Butchers' Mission, St. Andrew's Street, Liverpool; Of the following Mission Halls, Bromborough and Eastham; Liverpool (10), Wavertree (2), Tarbock, Lancashire, Field Road, New Brighton; Sunday School Union, Liverpool; Baptist Church, Rochester; of the following Presbyterian Churches: Hull, Liverpool; of the following Congregational Churches: Leigh, Lanes, Bristol; United Methodist Church, Ovenden; Primitive Methodist Church, Little Neston, Cheshire; Of the following Wesleyan Churches, Rochester, Hull, Alford (2); Evangelical Free Church Council, Brighouse; Free Church Council, Oxford and District; Redfield Road Church, Midsomer Norton; Primitive Methodist Church, Stone's Cross, Midsomer Norton; Primitive Methodist Church, Stone's Cross, Welton; Literary Society of St. James' Presbyterian Church, Bristol; Methodist Free Church (8 churches), Wednesbury; Trinity Congregational Church, Leeds; Of the following Wesleyan Methodist Sunday Schools, Derby, Colne, Churchill, Falmouth; Societies and Meetings at South

London, Halifax, Liverpool, Bootle, Hornsey, Camberwell, Kennington Park, Calvinistic Methodist Church, Shrewsbury; Wesley Church, West Hartlepool; Temperance Society, Ombersley; International Order of Good Templars, Rose of Eden Lodge, Shildon; Temperance Workers, Northumberland and Durham; Public Meetings, Baltonsborough; Wookey Hole, Taunton, Ilfracombe, Beaworthy, Somerton, Trevelmond Dobwalls, Mere, Cheltenham, Bramham, Ashcott, Chilton Polden, Grampound, Blagdon, Collingbourne, South Shields (9), Junction Street, Derby (2), Mevagissey (2), Keighley, Heckmondwike, Halifax, Whinfell, Preston Patrick; Church of Christ, Leicester (2); Gateshead, Creswell, Workington, Underwood, Mollington, Alfreton, Liversedge, Hastings, Wakefield; Sunday Evening School, Southwark; Christian Abstainers' Union, Manchester; Missions, Canterbury; Nutfield, Northampton (2), Bootle, Carshalton, Wavertree, Westminster Bridge Road, Bolton, Hastings (2), Women's Liberal Associations, Bromley, Kent, Northampton, Newquay; Societies and Meetings, Liskeard, Whitby, Colne, Poplar, Westminster Bridge Road, Kelvedon, Devon Union, Hull; Employees "Starch, Blue, and Black Lead Works" and W. J. Jacobs and Sons and their Employees, Plymouth; Licensing Bill Campaign Committee, Oxford and District; Church of Christ, Bedlington, Acklington, Lindale, Aspatria, Kirkby, Bristol, Bootle, Hucknall Torkard; Public Meetings, Bath, Dinton, Minehead, Langhope, High Littleton; Baptist Churches, Tytherington; Woodford, Thornbury, Morton, South Shields (2), Desborough; Congregational Churches, Thornbury, Barton St. David, Great Boughton, Brampton, South Shields, Hastings, Teignmouth; Sunday Schools, Sandford, Derby (3), Bude, Potterne, Brampton, Melbourne, South Shields (3), Denby Bottles (2), Colne; Bible Classes, Derby (2); Schools and Classes, South Shields, Derby, Desborough, Street, Colne; Brotherhoods, South Shields, Halifax; Guilds and Meetings, Leeds, Ilfracombe, Derby, Skelmersdale, East Dulwich, Bloomsbury, Sutton, Leeds, Derby; Methodist Christian Endeavour, Sheffield, Hull (3), Brampton, Teignmouth, South Shields (2); Primitive Methodist Church, Sunday School, and C.E., Derby; Young Men's Christian Association, South Shields, High Shields; Christian Endeavour Guild, Chester; Wesleyan Men's Bible Class, Bromley; A Public Meeting held at Gilstand on 14th November, 1908. Read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Petitions against: Of persons signing (5); read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (SCHEME FOR A NEW TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL).

Correspondence concerning the above, subsequent to the publication (in July last) of the proposals submitted to the Board of Education by the Representatives of certain Educational Associations.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTELLIGENCE DIVISION, PART II.).

Proceedings under the Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907, and Section 2 (subsection 3) of the Board of Agriculture Act, 1889, for the year 1907.

AFRICA, No. 5 (1908).

Further correspondence respecting the taxation of natives and other questions in the Congo State (in continuation of Africa, No. 4. (1908), [Cd. 4178.]).

TRADE REPORTS.

(Annual).—No. 4171. United States (Philippine Islands).

(Miscellaneous).—No. 670. Russia (Lumber Industry in the Russian Far East).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LAND TRANSFER ACTS, 1875 AND 1897.

Land Transfer Rules, 1908, dated 9th November, 1908, made in pursuance of Section 111 of the Land Transfer Act, 1875, and of Section 22 of the Land Transfer Act, 1897.

Land Transfer Fee Order, 1908, dated 9th November, 1908, made in pursuance of Section 112 of the Land Transfer Act, 1875, and of Section 22 of the Land Transfer Act, 1897.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) ACT, 1907.

Regulations made by the Local Government Board (1) as to foreign meat; (2) as to unsound meat.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

An Order, No. 7599, dated the 18th day of November, 1908, entitled the "Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1908."

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Order by the Secretary of State for Scotland, dated 8th October, 1908, providing for the early closing of certain classes of shops in the burgh of Hamilton.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

*EARL **ROBERTS** rose "To call the attention of His Majesty's Government to Lord Tweedmouth's statement on 18th May last, and to ask His Majesty's Government if the Committee of Imperial Defence therein referred to has arrived at any conclusions with respect to the necessity for guarding this country against invasion, and whether these conclusions demand a revision of the facts and figures laid down by the Chairman of the Committee of Imperial Defence in May, 1905; and to move to resolve, 'That in the opinion of this House the defence of these Islands necessitates the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government to the provision (in addition to a powerful Navy) of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores'; and also to move to resolve, 'That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in view of altered strategic conditions in the North Sea, that His Majesty's Government should, following the precedent set by Mr. Balfour in 1905, make a statement on the invasion problem and should state definitely the conclusions arrived at as the result of the recent inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence.'"

The noble and gallant Earl said: My Lords, during the last two years I have endeavoured from time to time to induce your Lordships to take into your serious consideration the vitally important question of home defence, but for some reason unaccountable to me, my efforts have hitherto been in vain. I can understand the general public turning a deaf ear to warnings that are distasteful to them. They are for the most part so fully occupied with their own affairs and their individual struggles for existence that they do not trouble themselves much as to what is going on in the outside world, but are content to trust the safety of their country to those whose duty it is to watch over it and to take all possible measures for its protection. That duty is yours, my Lords, as it is the duty of those elected by the people to look after their interests. It is a sacred duty, and I am deeply concerned that it should be neglected and that the warnings of men who like myself have earnestly studied the subject, against a danger which appears to us to be all too obvious, should have fallen hitherto on utterly stony ground. For, my Lords, if you, who know from history the fate that overtook all former great and flourishing maritime and commercial States which refused to undergo the personal sacrifices that alone could ensure the safety of their possessions—if you, who have the best means of ascertaining what is taking place in other countries, and who ought to be able to realise that our naval supremacy is being disputed, can rest satisfied to leave matters as they are, and, ignoring the great responsibility that rests upon you, neglect to do all in your power to get this country placed in such a state of defence as would make even the most powerful foreign nation hesitate to attack it, I cannot help feeling that a terrible awakening may be in store for us at no very distant period.

It is impressed upon the British public by a certain number of politicians, whose sole object apparently is to reduce military expenditure, without any thought of the proportionate risk to the country, that an invasion is an impossibility, a mere delusion of a few alarmists, who regard the maritime advancement made by our Continental neighbours in the interest of peace and commerce as a preparation for attack on these islands. By still another school the people are told that, as long as we have command of the sea, there is nothing to dread, for no foreign troops could ever land on British soil. And, my Lords, they are entreated by a third party to believe that a second line of 315,000 citizen soldiers, officered by men but slightly acquainted with the rudiments of soldiering, and with only the veneer of training which is to be given to such of them as choose to receive it, will be able to withstand and repulse the highly trained troops of a first-rate military Power. If the general public are led astray in this way by those to whom they look for guidance, how is it possible for them to come to any other conclusion than that we are very well as we are, and that there is no need to trouble ourselves about invasion, or to undergo the smallest personal sacrifice for our country?

But you, my Lords, have the means of judging for yourselves whether the politicians, in their anxiety to obtain funds, for, no doubt, most laudable objects, may not reduce the Navy and Army to such an extent as would render them incapable of performing the duties for which they are maintained. You should be able also to satisfy yourselves whether the Navy alone, under all eventualities, could ensure your slumbers never being disturbed. But whatever conclusions you may arrive at on these two points, let me beg of you not to believe for one moment that an inexperienced, inadequately trained second line of citizen soldiers could cope successfully with the thoroughly organised, highly-trained troops that would assuredly be selected for an attack on this country. Do not allow yourselves to be led away by specious argument, which is all the more dangerous from the fact that it accords with what we all would wish to believe.

It really would appear that all classes, in their anxiety to give Mr. Haldane fair play and help him in the arduous task he has undertaken, have become somewhat hypnotised. Soldiers apparently forgetting their well-founded and strongly expressed convictions of only a few years ago, seem now prepared to trust the same stamp of soldier, whose unfitness for service in the field they then pointed out in no measured terms. And this encourages civilians, who have not had the same opportunities for forming a correct opinion on the subject, to think that military preparation and adequate training are quite unnecessary, and that all that is required to ensure our country's safety is to have on paper a certain number of men, guns, and horses, to be turned into a fighting force if the enemy will give us six months' notice of his intention to attack.

I implore you, my Lords, to study this question for yourselves, and to satisfy yourselves whether the Territorial Army, as at present constituted, will be sufficient in numbers and efficient in quality for what it is required. Consider whether a week's or a fortnight's training for two or three years will suffice to make a lad, who has never been drilled or has never fired a rifle, into a useful soldier. And as regards the much-needed six months' training, supposing, for argument's sake, that we could calculate on being given six months warning, can we feel absolutely certain that the few patriotic employers who have allowed their men to join the Territorial Army, and are good enough to spare them for a week's or fortnight's training yearly would or could consent to their being taken away for six months, during which time their business would go to pieces, while their competitors in trade who have refused to allow their men to serve their country, would be reaping great benefit from their selfishness and want of patriotism?

My Lords, a home defence Army is either required or it is not required. If you come to the conclusion that it is not required and that the Navy can do all that is needed, I would ask you what can be the object of spending vast sums of money on Mr. Haldane's Territorial Army scheme. But if a home defence Army is required—and the only purpose for which it can be required is to resist invasion, and that possibly without any previous notice—then surely common sense tells us that it must be on a scale and so organised as to ensure its being able to deal successfully with any troops to which it is likely to be opposed. The question, then, on which I desire to fix your attention is whether invasion of this country is possible or is not possible, for it is upon the answer to this question that the necessity for our having an efficient Army for home defence rests. The facts that my noble and gallant friend Lord Lovat and I are about to place before you may, we hope, help you to come to a definite conclusion on this subject, and, holding the views we do, it will be an intense relief to us if we can convince your Lordships that our defensive arrangements cannot be left as they are without the safety of the country being seriously endangered.

Your Lordships will, no doubt, remember that Mr. Balfour, in his position as chairman of the Committee of Imperial Defence, made a speech in the House of Commons on 11th May, 1905, in which he indicated the conclusions the Committee had arrived at on the subject of home defence. These conclusions were based on data furnished by the Admiralty with reference to France, which country Mr. Balfour selected because, he said, it is—

> "The great nation which is nearest to us and from which invasion would be the most easy."

But more recent inquiries have shown that, although the data may have been correct as to France in 1905, they are not correct as regards Germany in 1908. The conditions by which Mr. Balfour was guided are completely changed—as the right hon. Gentleman stated at the time was likely to happen—and I trust it will be possible to satisfy your Lordships that we can no longer feel ourselves safe from the possibility of invasion, and that Lord Lovat and I are justified in once more pressing the question of home defence upon this House. Mr. Balfour, in stating the problem to the House of Commons, assumed as an hypothesis that our Regular Army was abroad upon some over-sea expedition, and that our organised Fleets in permanent commission were absent from home waters. He then proceeded to explain the amount of tonnage necessary for 70,000 men, which was considered to be the smallest force with which, under the most favourable circumstances, an invasion could possibly be made; the number of ships suitable for such a force available in French ports throughout the year; the time required for embarkation and disembarkation; and the places where landings were most likely to be attempted.

After discussing all the pros and cons as to the manner in which such an invasion would probably be carried out, Mr. Balfour concluded with these words—

> "I trust I have convinced the House that, even in these suppositions, unfavourable as they are [to us] serious invasion of these islands is not a possibility which we need discuss."

This strongly expressed opinion of Mr. Balfour's has had a most unfortunate effect. The War Office, which up to that time had been preparing a home defence Army equal to any emergency then contemplated, at once stopped all schemes for resisting an invasion, and decided that it was only necessary to provide against a couple of small raids of 5,000 men each, while the public accepted the statement with delight. It was, indeed, just what they wanted to hear. They were only too glad to have such high authority for confirming their belief that military precautions against invasion are entirely unnecessary. My Lords, I have good reason for knowing that this is the case, for, in my endeavours to convince our fellow-countrymen that it is their sacred duty to prepare themselves to take a useful part in the defence of their own homes, I am frequently met with this response—"Our homes are in no danger; why should we do anything of the sort? No Army is needed for home defence, for we have the late Prime Minister's assurance that invasion is a matter about which we need not trouble ourselves." This settled conviction is not confined to the proletariat, for Lord Lovat can tell you that at the public schools and Universities which he visited when preparing a scheme for a Reserve of Officers, one of the chief reasons put forward by the masters and graduates for not responding to his call was their belief in the immunity of these islands from invasion. His experience was the same when subsequently serving on a War Office Committee appointed by Mr. Haldane for a similar purpose. It thus became evident to us that it was hopeless to look for any improvement in the Home Army so long as this false belief in our security from invasion should so widely exist, and we determined to find out whether the information furnished to Mr. Balfour three or four years ago as to the power of France to invade this country was in all respects correct; whether it was applicable to Germany at the present time, and whether any fresh data regarding the movement of troops by sea could be obtained by a study of the Russo-Japanese War.

Great pains have been taken to get at the truth, and our researches have proved that the question of invasion now differs materially from the aspect it presented when Mr. Balfour made his speech in 1905. To begin with, Mr. Balfour only considered the question from the point of view of the invading force coming from France, while we have gone into it on the supposition that it would come from Germany. By taking France as an instance of the quarter from which danger might arise, Mr. Balfour did so only to illustrate his argument. That did not imply hostility to France or fear of France. So far was that from being the case that Mr. Balfour's Government was at that time drawing closer to France. What Mr. Balfour claimed, and was so well justified in claiming, when he referred to France, I claim for my analogous reference to Germany. It implies no hostility, which it would be impossible for me of all people to feel in the slightest degree. It implies no fear. What we are bound to do, without offence or without suspicion of foreign countries, is to take their military position into account in considering what ought to be our own military arrangements. This is done every day in the case of the Navy without offence being meant or taken. We are constantly—Ministers, Government, and all—discussing our Navy with direct reference to the strength of foreign navies. Why should we give offence by discussing our Army in the same way?

With regard, then, to Germany, my Lords, we have ascertained without the possibility of a doubt that vessels suitable for accommodating 200,000 men are at all times available in the northern ports of Germany; that, as the result of their new "service law," by which the period with the Colours is decreased and the period in the Reserve increased, that number of men could be collected during several months in the year, in the districts nearest to those ports, without any fuss or mobilisation arrangements being put into force; that the railway facilities are such as would admit of an army of that strength being brought to the several ports and embarked in a much shorter time than had been stated with regard to France; that, instead of three tons per man being required, as was previously estimated, one and a half tons would be quite sufficient for all purposes; and that, with the enormous boat accommodation of the big modern liners, with the frequent practice of troops in embarking and disembarking, with the education given to the officers of the mercantile marine serving in the Reserve, and with the various mechanical appliances which now exist, the disembarkation of German troops could be carried out far more expeditiously than had been thought possible in the case of French troops.

In other words, our researches have proved that a force of 150,000 German soldiers could be transported in the same number of vessels that Mr. Balfour had been informed would be needed for half that number of French soldiers, and that the embarkation and disembarkation would occupy a much shorter period than was supposed to be necessary for the smaller force. It is true that the distance is greater from Germany to England than from France to England, but this is only an apparent disadvantage, for German ports are really nearer to those places on our eastern coast most likely to be selected for the disembarkation of an invading army than are the ports on which our own Fleets are usually based. Then a glance at the chart of the North Sea will show you that the German base is in a sense a double one, since it includes both the North Sea and the Baltic, and for naval purposes these two bases are practically one, owing to their being connected by the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal.

Another and most important advantage to Germany is that, owing to the railways being in the hands of the State, all the preliminary arrangements, up to the actual despatch of the troops, could be carried out with infinitely more secrecy than in France. Another and equally important advantage is that owing to the North Sea being less crowded with shipping than the English Channel, once the German transports had started, they could procced to their respective objectives with much less chance of being detected than would be the case with French transports in the Channel. With the facts we are able to give you, my Lords, and which we have been at pains to verify, I think you must realise that in Germany there would be no difficulty as to the requisite number of troops being speedily collected, as to the amount of tonnage needed for the transport of the same being always available, or as to the great local facilities that exist for embarkation purposes.

The only question that remains is the question of the feasibility of keeping us in ignorance of what was happening until too late for us to prevent a landing. The question of absolute secrecy is one on which we do not insist. We hold that an invasion would be in the nature of a surprise, at a time when it was least expected, and when we might be—as at the present moment—quite unprepared for it. We place no faith in our receiving sufficient warning, and we believe that, owing to the entirely different conditions which prevail in the two countries, what would be impossible in Great Britain would be quite possible in Germany. The German Government is methodical, and in time of crisis would practically become an executive despotism, with control over the telegraph and post offices, over the railways, and, above all, over the Press, and under such conditions it might be difficult, if not impossible, for us to ascertain what was going on.

Then the North Sea is open, and our coast line opposite Germany is extended. The Germans have the choice of landing at various places on our shores, and up to the very end we might remain in ignorance as to their intentions. Even if the surprise should fail and we knew that the Armada had started, our fleets might miss what they were hunting for; they might, so to speak, grope vainly for their object in the metaphorical initial "fog of war," intensified as it might be by an actual sea fog in the English Channel which constantly causes such disaster to our shipping, and they might never have the opportunity to strike, as has happened over and over again with our most experienced commanders. There is, therefore, a chance, and a very serious chance, that a German army might get into this country as a result simply of the efficiency of the measures taken to secure secrecy, and against this the utmost strength and resources of our Navy can give us no protection whatever.

The Germans are perfectly aware that it would be essential for their transports to elude our fleets. In order to effect this—the only obstacle to a successful invasion of these isles—would they not naturally and necessarily resort to every deceptive device of war? Would they not try to mislead and distract the fleets? They would most assuredly not confine themselves, as we have always hitherto been asked to believe, to one large expedition offering the broadest target, and enabling us to concentrate our efforts on that target, which would be greatly to simplify our problem. Would they not rather draw us and our attention away from their main objective by despatching one or two small raids, which we admittedly could not be sure of intercepting, to points other than those selected for the landing? Our naval forces might be entangled in the pursuit of those minor expeditions, and, while we should be engaged in trying to deal with them, the main debarkation might be taking place undisturbed. It is surely quite clear that if we have to depend upon a brief warning either from our agents abroad, or upon our scouting system on the seas, we could not be certain for some time whether we had to deal with the expedition meant to act as a feint or with the real attack. I will not now attempt to work this out in detail, but that such methods might succeed at sea, as they have repeatedly succeeded in surprise operations on land, must be quite obvious.

But let us take the next point in connection with the secrecy essential to the successful landing of the main invasion. It must be perfectly well known to the German General Staff and the German Admiralty that we might be more effectually distracted by false information than by silent secrecy. A rumour might be allowed to be spread abroad at the last moment that an attack would be made on certain points of our coast where no attack was really intended, or a raid of 10,000 to 15,000 men, or a couple of raids of that strength, might actually be sent towards those points with the full recognition that they would be captured when their object had been attained. Anyhow, my Lords, it seems clear to me that we have really no guarantee whatever that our Fleets would certainly succeed in intercepting the main Armada of a German invasion. It would be folly to shut our eyes to the possibilities I have endeavoured to describe; at any rate, nobody can now deny that they are possibilities, and not—as the people of this country have been assured—impossibilities.

Grave responsibility rests upon any one who misleads our countrymen by encouraging them to continue in their belief that an invasion of these shores is impossible. I think you must know that Lord Lovat and I have no private ends to serve, and that the safety of our country is our only aim. Therefore, when we tell you, after the most matured consideration, that it is our firm conviction that it is perfectly possible for our Fleets to be effectually misled and evaded, and that this country might be invaded before having the opportunity of bringing her tremendous sea power into play, you must, I think, agree that, when a serious difference of opinion exists on such a vital point, it is wiser to place ourselves on the safe side by acting as if the danger were a reality, rather than by allowing ourselves to be persuaded by those who deny the danger to take no steps to meet it. However much we may desire peace, surely the startling events that have occurred in the Near East within the last two months must have brought it home to the most careless observer that nothing can save a country which is unprepared to protect itself and safeguard its own possessions. No alliances, no treaties, avail. Every nation must depend upon itself, and if, as I have frequently said before, we continue to neglect to take the most ordinary precautions, we may some day find ourselves at the mercy of the invader and forced to submit to the most ignominious terms. And I would remind those who think that a powerful Navy is all we need that our responsibilities are varied, and that we might at any time have to send our home Fleets, or portions of them, to distant parts of the world, to Asia, Africa, America, Australasia, or even to places in Europe, as we have had frequently to do in days gone by, while a foreign Navy—with no such responsibilities—might be collected in full force in our immediate neighbourhood in a position to take advantage of the absence of our protectors.

Is it not evident, however we look at it, that the danger upon which we insist is becoming every day more threatening and the undertaking every day more practicable? Within one single decade Germany has created, takings ships and men together, and counting intellectual organisation as well as mechanical resources, the greatest sea-power that has yet existed except our own. At this very moment formidable—if perfectly legitimate and praiseworthy—measures are being taken for the further increase of that power. The German North Sea harbours are being improved. The Kaiser Wilhelm Canal is to be widened and deepened. No ports in the world are so well equipped with quays and railway facilities as are the German ports. None are kept so carefully up to date. The German mercantile marine is becoming each day more efficient in respect of the number and speed of its large steamships. Day by day the period required for every stage of an invading operation is made shorter, day by day the chances of success are increased. Severe as has been the financial strain lately, there never has been in the German Parliament anything like such a large majority in favour of naval development as there now is. And the point which Lord Lovat and I particularly desire to impress upon this House and upon the country generally is that we can never be certain of defeating an attempted invasion by naval means alone. Even those who persist in believing in the improbability of such an attempt ever being made must admit that it is the improbable that constantly happens in war as in politics, and that it is the unexpected that most often succeeds in war. It is calculated that there are 80,000 Germans in the United Kingdom, almost all of them trained soldiers. They work many of the hotels at some of the chief railway stations, and if a German force once got into this country it would have the advantage of help and reinforcement such as no other army on foreign soil has ever before enjoyed.

I will not take up much more of your time, but before I put the Motion that stands in my name there are two points to which I wish to draw special attention. One is that, for the purpose of invasion, it is not an absolute necessity for a nation to have command of the sea in the sense that command of the sea is generally understood. Local or temporary command would suffice. The Germans are fully aware of this, and in General Bonsart von Schellendorf's textbook on "The Duties of the General Staff," after pointing out how in former wars "the want of a strong Navy has been bitterly felt," and explaining how, in order "to co-operate effectively, the Army and Navy must have a common objective—namely, the rapid destruction of the enemy's forces"—he goes on to say—

> "The advantages of gaining the command of the sea, at least for a time, and thereby making possible the transport of troops by sea, may justify the loss of our own Fleet."

These are remarkable words, not only because they represent the best German teaching on the co-operation of the two services in war, but because they convey a warning which I most earnestly beseech you, and the country generally, to take to heart.

The other point is that, no matter how strong and powerful our Navy is, the main preventive of invasion is a numerous and efficient Home Army, and the main temptation to invasion is the want of such an Army—the knowledge, in fact, that the country to be invaded is dependent for its defence upon an uncertain number of inadequately-trained citizen soldiers. Even if our Navy were doubly as strong as it is relatively to that of other Powers, the necessity for maintaining a sufficient and efficient citizen Army for home defence would still be an essential condition of peace and security, as well as of public confidence. That citizen Army must be numerically a certainty, and strong enough, and sufficiently trained to enable it to hold its own successfully against at least 150,000 highly-trained Continental soldiers. In order to do this and to meet the other many demands that would be made upon it, the citizen Army must consist of a million of men. If your Lordships will bear with me for a few minutes longer I will explain why such a large number is necessary, what the Territorial Army now consists of, and how impossible it would be for it, even if it ever attains its established strength, to do all that is needed. I expressly refer to the Territorial Army because that is the only portion of our military forces the condition of which affects the question at issue, for it stands to reason that there is much more chance of invasion being attempted when the Regular Army is abroad than when that Army would be available to take part in the defence of this country.

The actual situation, my Lords, at the present moment is as follows:—Strength of the Territorial Force, say, 200,000 men; strength of the Special Reserve, say, 60,000; net surplus of Regulars after the despatch of the expeditionary force, which, owing to the Army Reserve being temporarily increased by the reduction of battalions and the three years' enlistment scheme introduced by Lord Midleton, now stands at a higher than the normal figure, say, 93,000—total available for home defence, say, 353,000. From these figures must be deducted 15 per cent. for sick and absent, leaving about 300,000, from which again must be deducted untrained recruits, not less, I imagine, than 60,000, leaving a balance of 240,000 men available. It must be remembered also that the object of the Special Reserve is to support the Field Army, and that within a few months, possibly within a few weeks, of mobilisation its best elements may be out of the country; also that in the spring we are poorer by some 17,000 drafts (needed to keep regiments abroad to their full strength) than in the autumn.

Taking 240,000, however, as an approximate figure of more or less trained men available, the requirements that would have to be provided out of that number for protecting the arsenals and naval bases, and garrisoning the principal places in Great Britain and Ireland, must be noted before any estimate can be made of the force that would be available for home defence. For these requirements, not less than 200,000 men would be necessary, leaving only 40,000 citizen soldiers for the Home Defence Force, which, at four to one to meet 150,000 invaders, should amount to 600,000. Large as this proportion of untrained to trained men may appear it is the proportion recognised by all experienced authorities from Napoleon's time as the smallest that can be safely relied on in war. And in a life and death struggle, such as an invasion of this country would mean for us, it would be folly, indeed, to trust to any less number of men.

These figures are most disheartening, I may say, appalling; the more so, because until the country will agree to a practical system of military training, by which Mr. Haldane's admirable framework can be filled in with the required number of soldiers fit to take the field, they mean that the Navy must be tied to our shores, that the Expeditionary Force will be kept at home by public fears, and that British diplomacy will be deprived of that armed force without which, as recent events have shown, diplomacy is of very little avail. Thanks to Mr. Haldane, we are now getting a satisfactory military organisation, but if we are to provide against the possibility of invasion, even five years hence, we must begin at once to get together the material for a thoroughly useful Home Army. To argue that because the country is for the moment in no immediate danger we need not make any preparation is to encourage national neglect and the procrastinating weakness for which we have paid so dearly in the past—in fact, to invite national ruin.

The more I reflect on it, the more it seems to me that there lies in front of us one of the strangest spectacles that has ever been witnessed in the world. Across the narrow seas, opposite our shores, within a few hours' steaming of our coasts, there is a people numbering over 60,000,000; our most active rivals in commerce and the greatest military Power in the world, no longer depending upon her supremacy in one arm, but adding to an overwhelming military strength a naval force which she is resolutely and rapidly increasing; while we, on our side, are not attempting to take any military precautions in response. Germany cannot justly be blamed for the situation; rather she should be praised and her example followed, for her people, by their industry, their perseverance, their sound system of education, and by the advantageous military training which every able-bodied man receives, have made her a great nation. The Germans require outlets for their commerce and their steadily increasing population. To fulfil this requirement they recognise the necessity for having a strong navy, in addition to their matchless army, which is essential to their existence in the very centre of Europe. For more than two centuries, my Lords, we have considered it necessary from time to time to increase our Navy, and instead of taking exception to Germany's action—which we most certainly have no right to do—our business is to find out in what way we are likely to be affected by this great increase of sea power to Germany and to adopt such measures as may be necessary for our own protection.

My Lords, I only repeat these appeals in obedience to a most solemn conviction. Words cannot express the responsibility which lies at this time upon the members of both branches of the Legislature. We are not here only, nor even chiefly, for the purposes of the moment. We are the trustees for the future of the Empire. Upon what is done or neglected in Parliament beforehand must depend sooner or later the fate of England and of the British Dominions throughout the world. We are bound in this House to look beyond the bawling and the brawling of the day, and to uphold Imperial policy above the clamour of selfish or short-sighted interests. Is not this, indeed, the greater part of our duty? Unless we occupy ourselves most earnestly, and under a sense of personal trusteeship, with the means by which the safety and greatness of our country, continued from age to age, may be maintained in time to come, we cannot justify our existence even against the subversive force challenging this House to-day, and we shall not escape the heavy judgment of history.

We are links in a living chain, pledged to transmit intact to posterity the glorious heritage we have received from those who have gone before us in this place. We know that the world is altering, and, indeed, that the conditions of international politics in both hemispheres are changing with unexampled rapidity. Upon the one hand, it is agreed that naval development, in many countries simultaneously, is bringing about a fundamental change in the conditions of sea power. Upon the other hand, we, as an Empire, have the most extensive land frontier in existence, although our military resources are insignificant by comparison with those of the Great Powers of Europe and Asia. It is the most vital necessity of our situation that we should have in the future, as in the past, not only the strongest and most powerful Navy, but complete strategic freedom for that Navy. Under these new conditions we can never again enjoy that freedom without a total change in our military arrangements. The Navy, under present circumstances, is fettered to home waters as it never was before, and without a military force sufficient of itself to make invasion hopeless, and to keep these islands secure under the initial circumstances of war, it surely must be plain to every one—who will give the matter a thought—that our military weakness, if continued, will be the probable cause of the loss of our naval supremacy.

This is not a party question; it is essentially a national question—a question which, as a soldier speaking from the cross benches, I consider it my duty to lay before your Lordships on both sides of this House. My feeling and conviction on this matter are strengthened by the grave events which at this very moment cloud the horizon of the East of Europe with uncertainty; and it is my absolute belief that, without a military organisation more adequate to the certain perils of the future, our Empire will fall from us and our power will pass away. I beg to move to resolve—

"That in the opinion of this House the defence of these islands necessitates the imdiate attention of His Majsety's Government to the provision (in addition to a powerful Navy) of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores——"

And here I have been asked by Lord Wemyss to add—

"And thus give practical effect to the Resolution unanimously agreed to by the House on 10th July, 1905;"

and also to move to resolve—

"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in view of altered strategic conditions in the North Sea, that His Majesty's Government should, following the precedent set by Mr. Balfour in 1905, make a statement on the invasion problem, and should state definitely the conclusions arrived at as the result of the recent inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence."

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House the defence of these Islands necessitates the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government to the provision (in addition to a powerful Navy) of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores, and thus give practical effect to the Resolution unanimously agreed to by the House on 10th July, 1905; and that in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in view of altered stragetic conditions in the North Sea, that His Majesty's Government should, following the precedent set by Mr. Balfour in 1905, make a statement on the invasion problem, and should state definitely the conclusions arrived at as the result of the recent inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence."—(*Earl Roberts.*)

Lord LOVAT: My Lords, I should like to bring to your Lordships' attention one or two facts by way of supplement to what has fallen from the noble Lord who has just sat down. I shall have in the course of my remarks to go into certain questions with regard to the details of the organisation and preparation of the North Sea ports, and I should like to make my point abundantly clear, not because I believe that the North Sea Power has any hostile views against us, but because it is the Power which has the greatest possibility for action over-seas, and therefore is the Power from the point of view of defence most worthy of our study and preparation against. In giving you a few facts as to the state of preparation of the North Sea ports I shall not argue that that preparation is intended for use against us, or that there is any reason why it should be put into operation against us in any hostile manner in the near future, but I do earnestly put before your Lordships that these facilities do exist, and as they exist they must be watched in time of peace if we wish to be ready for them in time of war. It would be very easy at the present moment to make an alarmist speech, but in view of the many questions which have been asked in another House about unfortunate occurences in this country or letters, etc., over-seas, I wish to confine myself entirely to matters of fact, because a great many of these vague stories that we have heard told about various endeavours in this country I place little credence in, and I certainly do not wish to refer to them at the present time. I would like to make a second point clear, and that is that in the course of my speech, I shall have to attack Mr. Balfour's speech of 1905, or rather that portion of his speech which was inspired by his expert advisers. With Mr. Balfour's attitude in defining the strategic position by sea and by land I have no quarrel, because it is surely a statesmanlike act when preparing a military policy to take the advice of military experts in order to foreshadow what that policy ought to be. Again I have no quarrel with Mr. Balfour because of the wild theories which have since been fathered on his 1905 speech, but I have to quarrel with his speech from this point of view, that it gave certain facts and figures which may have been true in 1905, but which are totally irrelevant to-day, and which, if we continue to base our military policy upon them, will very likely lead us into error in the future. It is necessary to attack the findings of Mr. Balfour's expert advisers because that speech has been the foundation of so many acts of military administration since. For instance, we can trace directly to it the 10,000 limited raid theory; we trace to it this idea of six months' warning and preparation before any hostile attack can be made; we trace to it the mobilisation schemes only dealing with the small raids; and we trace to it the theory of the training of a Territorial Army.

You may ask why we hold these strong views on the subject of the 1905 speech when it has not been attacked before. The reason for this I think is plain, and it is that we had no wish to come forward publicly in this matter; the defence of this country is far too grave a question for a speech like Mr. Balfour's to be attacked unless it is as a last resource. We have now gathered facts which rebut certain of Mr. Balfour's advisers' figures that were brought forward by him in his speech. We laid these some sixteen months ago before a certain Committee, and it is only now that we have reason to suppose that no finding is to be made public on the subject that we have thought it necessary to come forward at the present time.

The first figure of Mr. Balfour's expert advisers that I should like to speak on is that with regard to the amount of shipping, which he laid down as 100,000 tons, and on which he pressed a strong point, that the collection of sufficient shipping to bring over a force of any size would be a matter of days. As Lord Roberts has pointed out, in the North Sea ports there are three times the amount of shipping which Mr. Balfour laid down, and I think if one based one's calculations on those figures it would be as irrelevant as if when one were calculating an invasion of Turkey by a first class Power one were to base his calculations on how much shipping there might be in the Montenegrin ports.

There was a standard laid down by Mr. Balfour that three tons per man would be required for getting an expeditionary force across from Germany to this land. That figure was not only incorrect at the time but it is a figure which has been incorrect for 150 years. For example, in 1757, Mr. Copeland, the Secretary of the Admiralty, wrote down to say that it was the finding of the Sea Lords that one ton per man was amply sufficient for the transportation of troops for a month's journey, and fifty years later Napoleon crossing to Egypt was able with 47,000 tons of shipping to embark 54,000 men, carrying at the same time 170 guns and horses with thirteen months supplies. We have also later on Sir John Ardagh, who gives evidence that in the Turkish War some two men were carried per ton. I mention these facts to show you that some of these figures that have been calculated by the experts who advised Mr. Balfour in his 1905 speech were based on very flimsy grounds, and not only so but if those advisers had taken the trouble to read the manuals of either the French or German authorities they would have discovered that it was actually laid down that one ton per man was all that was required for carrying a force such a short journey as from Germany to these shores.

Lord Roberts has laid great stress upon the point that all calculations with regard to the possibilities of invasion and as to the facilities which exist in the North Sea ports for invasion should be frequently revised. He has shown you how the mere fact of a new Reservist Law which has increased the number of men who are serving in certain times of the year, from April to September, doing their periods of service with the colours, may make units which would have taken the usual nine to eleven days to mobilise; but, we know that there have been cases in France and Germany of the mobilisation of large Army corps complete in transport and supplies, the men being equipped down to the last button, which corps have been warned for mobilisation in the middle of the night, and have paraded three hours later complete in every detail.

We know that every year the commerce and the extended facilities required for commerce are making the dispatch of troops to any particular point more easily done, and we know that continental nations habitually move numbers like 87,000 men in a single day without interfering with the regular traffic. All these points make it necessary that whatever figures are laid down by expert advisers must be continually checked and brought up to date.

Upon the question of the actual landing of troops on these shores, Mr. Balfour in his speech made a great point of how the ships that were carrying over foreign troops would have to lie two days at anchor, and would take forty-eight hours to land their men, and that during the two days and two nights that they lay there they would be at the mercy of attacks by torpedo destroyers and submarines. He pictured the difficulty of getting the troops off, and he showed how the transports might ram each other in making their way out into the open sea. That picture was an excellent one if his facts had only been correct—if his naval advisers had been correct when they told him that it would take forty-eight hours to get the men off the ships. We argue that it is only necessary to take twelve hours to do that work, and in this we certainly have history on our side. In the Crimean War, 52,000 men were landed in a single day under difficult circumstances. In Algiers in the beginning of last century, 41,000 men were landed on the north coast of Africa in a morning. Again, we find cases of 7,000 Germans in practice landing in one hour and a half. We find instances, such as in Chili, of landing practically a division and fighting a battle inland the same day, and of other divisions landing in the morning and engaging in sham fights seventeen miles off in the afternoon.

I give these figures to show that one must accept it that, provided the space for landing is sufficient, the landing is the pace of the slowest boat; the limit of front in which an invading force can land is only that which prevents any part of that landing force being taken in detail. On the East Coast of England and Scotland we have, as the Landing Committee of some years ago will tell you, ample space for such landings to take place, and with a mobilisation scheme which deals with such a small number of people landing it would necessarily follow, if we had some 150,000 foreigners coming over here, that they could afford to be widely distributed along that area.

I need not take you any further into the facts which Lord Roberts put before you, because I do not think His Majesty's Government will deny the calculation that 150,000 men can be put on board ships in thirty-six hours, that they can be taken over to our coast, whether it is from France or from Germany, in under a day, or at any rate in twenty-four hours, and that with regard to the time of landing, though it may take more than twelve hours, on historical grounds there is no reason for so supposing. I have gone into this question of Mr. Balfour's figures at some length, or rather the figures of Mr. Balfour's expert advisers, because until those figures are definitely rejected, by the whole nation, we have no chance of having an Army in this country, whether it is on the lines on which the noble Lord who has just spoken advocates or whether it is formed on the lines of the Territorial Army. Those who believe in the possibility of invasion base their arguments on facts and peace conditions as they exist at the present time in the countries over-seas: that is to say, the Continental system of intelligent preparation for war, so that mobilisation can take place in the very shortest time possible. They base their case on no hypothesis except the one that a nation which means to attack will choose the best time for so doing, when they are best prepared and we are least organised. and it is on that one hypothesis, which, after all, is a hypothesis of commonsense, that we should act, and it is on the knowledge of that which Napoleon said each leader should credit his adversary with possessing, that we base our case. We do not hold that when our Fleet is in the North Sea in superior numbers an invading force will come over, and we do not believe that when the Army has had six months notice and when the Territorial Army have been trained and we have our Fleet at home we shall have any invasion; but we do contend that in case of our getting embroiled in any difficulty abroad which would take away a portion of our Fleet and a portion of our Army that this nation is in serious danger of invasion. We do not base our case on the bolt from the blue theory that in time of profound peace an enemy would try for a surprise, but we do hold that diplomacy and military aggression may march hand in hand, and that a world policy can create a situation of which the sword would under certain circumstances be ready to take advantage. We hold that treaties can be torn up in a few hours, that a military nation cannot be created in a year, and that strained relations at any time when the opportunity is suitable may be taken advantage of and find us unprepared.

The other case, the case of those who do not believe in invasion, is based on a series of hypotheses. They hold, in the first place, the hypothesis of the command of the sea, that is to say, that the Fleet is in the right place. For invasion purposes, it is very obvious it is no use singing "Rule Britannia" in the Atlantic, when another tune is being sung in the North Sea, and equally so it must be accepted that for invasion purposes tactical supremacy at the critical spot is the only thing which is going to count.

If you look at certain cases in the last few years, I think you will find that our Fleet has not always been in the right spot at the critical time. There have been, for example, two cases in a time of profound peace, and two cases in a time of strained relations. At the time of the Dogger Bank incident the whole of our battleships were at Vigo Bay; at the time of the Lagos manœuvres it was admitted by the front bench of His Majesty's Government that no ship fully manned was at sea within three and a half days, and within four and a half days there was no other vessel than vessels of the "Royal Sovereign" class, which were then obsolete. Again, in recent times, when the state of Europe was not altogether peaceful, by the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, eight of our Channel Fleet were in dock, and, again, when the vessels of a certain North Sea Power were mobilised in the North Sea the whole of our Fleet was at Lamlash Bay. I do not know whether on any one of those four occasions if trouble had come any noble Lord would say that our Fleet was well posted.

But, apart from that, is there not a situation which may arise at any time, that is, that when our Fleet is in the North Sea it has no walls to lie behind, because our harbours are unsuitable, and practically not accessible, and, therefore, they would be liable to surprise; while if they are not in the North Sea, with the conditions of mine-laying which exist in a narrow strait like the Straits of Dover, and the possibilities of submarines which all Continental Powers are building, and which some of those Powers have already got, with a battle fleet that might be lying guarding the mined field and preventing the cutting out of the mined field by small boats—which is the usual way—I say might not a very grave situation arise if a fleet of submarines and mining boats ha prepared the Dover Channel, and our

Fleet from their normal bases at Portland and Portsmouth had to make their way up the Channel to get into the North Sea?

Then there is the hypothesis on which those who believe in our immunity from invasion insist, and that is the question of what one might call the brigandage theory. I do not exactly think that this brigandage theory is much further believed in now, since recent events in Eastern Europe, but I would ask your Lordships to remember that there must be surely some reason why three Continental nations keep mobolised on their frontiers three of their very finest Army corps to prevent something. It is obvious, therefore, that the brigandage theory must be believed in, otherwise one can have no idea why nine Army corps should be kept in a state of continual mobilisation. Why, if Continental nations have this fear, should we not have this it, merely because there is a thin streak of water between us and the mainland of Europe?

There is a further postulate which is made and that is the invasion question of which Lord Roberts spoke. It is the idea that our fleets being in the right place would at once block all foreign ports. I feel certain that this theory is laid down by men who have not taken part in active service of any shape or kind. I would ask your Lordships to remember what happened in the Franco-Prussian war, when armies of 80,000 lost each other, and what happened in the Manchurian or the South African war, when it was undoubtedly proved to demonstration that a surround or a blockade was practically never effective, and with an extended coastline on the North Sea and with its liability to fog, a blockade would probably be more difficult there than the blockade of a port in any other part of the world.

There is a third postulate which is made: that is the impossibility of secrecy. We base our case on the idea that no preparation is made in time of peace; our whole figures are based on the fact that we take peace conditions, the normal conditions which exist in a country which is ready for war. We ask for nothing for any of our calculations either for getting the men to the coasts or for getting the ships out of the harbours, except those peace conditions which exist every day of the year. There is a further hypothesis which is taken; that is the question of landing. It is laid down that landing will not take twelve hours, but that for some reason it will take a great deal more; it is said that the transports commanded by amateurs, by men of the Naval Reserve, will run against each other and that other difficulties will occur. But may I point out that these manœuvres are regularly practised in the Baltic, the Reservists being placed in command of ships which are practised in the landing of men? Then it is said that weather conditions may affect a landing. I would ask your Lordships to study the periodicity of storms as laid down by our experts on the subject, in which you will find that in certain times of the year the chances are fifty to one against a storm occurring, and in one month of the year on seven-ninths of the days in that month in an average year there is never more than a three feet wave in the North Sea. We have no reason to say that these difficulties are such as believers in our immunity from invasion would have us hold, and I would ask your Lordships to consider what is the position if we have not an adequate land defence force, whatever one thinks of the possibility of invasion, which would render invasion in any considerable force impossible. If we have not got this defence force we have tied our Fleets for all time to our shores, and we shall be unable to fulfil our function as a world Power to let our Fleet carry out its duties as a strategic cavalry defence, as it were. The wit of no man can tell in which place in the world's combinations of interests offence may not arise against us, and if we wish to maintain our position as a world Power it surely lies with us to base our defence at home on solid grounds, so that we can enable our Navy to carry out the duties for which it was originally intended.

*THE EARL OF CROMER: My Lords, in the very brief observations that I am about to address to your Lordships, I do not propose to deal with any military details—I must leave those matters to others who are more conversant with that subject than myself. My main reason for intervening in the debate is, as your Lordships will remember, that on the occasion of a debate which took place in this House last summer I made some observations as regards the possibility of war and the desirability of preparing for such a contingency, which attracted a good deal of attention and criticism. In fact, it is impossible to deal with this very difficult and delicate subject without incurring a good deal of criticism and even of misrepresentation. If one dwells upon the desirability of adopting an internal policy calculated to be conducive to the peace of Europe one is apt to be accused of an unworthy desire to truckle to foreign nations. If, on the other hand, one hints at the possibility of war and urges the need of preparation, one is instantly dubbed an alarmist and a disturber of the peace. I have incurred both those accusations at various times; and, although I plead not guilty to both charges, I wish to say that, although one distinguished member of His Majesty's Government, the President of the Board of Trade, said at a public meeting a short time ago that my warnings last July were "nonsense," I adhere to every word I then said, and I adhere to every word I said even with emphasis. I am a strong advocate of peace; and possibly, if the history of recent times ever comes to be written, it may be shown that within the very limited sphere of my action I have acted quite as strenuously and with as much practical effect in the interests of peace as either the President of the Board of Trade or many of my critics. I am also equally convinced of the necessity of preparing for war. Therefore, when I saw, as I thought, His Majesty's Government rushing somewhat hastily into large and unknown expenditure, without telling us where the money was to come from to meet it, I certainly thought that a word of warning was necessary. I entirely agree with what the noble Earl on the cross benches said, that recent events have shown that that warning was necessary. It would be improper on the present occasion to dwell at any length upon recent affairs in the East. Our interests in the East are in the hands of the distinguished statesman who presides at the Foreign Office, and who commands the respect and confidence of all parties in the State. But there is one point bearing on the present issue to which I may briefly allude, and that is that although diplomacy can do a great deal, it cannot do everything to preserve peace; it must have force behind it.

The President of the Board of Trade, to one of whose utterances I have already alluded, made, a little while ago at a public meeting, some rather disparaging remarks about modern diplomacy. He said, as far as I can understand the right hon. Gentleman, that he thought if the diplomatists had been sufficiently skilful, and had shown sufficient foresight, the recent crisis in the East might have been avoided. I am wholly unable to share that view. What I think the recent crisis has shown is that under the stress of circumstances, the temptation to ignore Treaty obligations is so great as to be at times incapable of being resisted. And, therefore, any nation, particularly a nation of our wealth and possessions, which relies wholly on treaties for maintaining its rights, is acting very foolishly.

With reference to the Army, there is certainly one point to which I wish to allude. I have always regarded, with a certain amount of apprehension, one portion of the programme of the Government, that is, the portion which involves the carrying out of the destructive part of the programme, that is to say, the abolition of those regiments of the line before anything was certainly known as to what success would attend the constructive portion. No doubt we shall hear more on this point from the opposite Benches; and if noble Lords opposite can assure us that we are now in as good a position to meet all contingencies that may arise, as we were before that programme began, no one will be more pleased than myself. Before I sit down I desire to say one word as to the terms of the noble Earl's Motion. As long as the noble Earl confines himself generally to urging that the country should be guarded against the risk of invasion, and that for that purpose we require not only a powerful Navy, but also a strong Army, I entirely agree with him. But the noble Earl has now added a Motion in which he invites His Majesty's Government to make an authoritative statement about the invasion problem. I confess that I rather doubt whether the present moment is a very suitable one for those who are responsible for the Government of this country to make an authoritative statement of that kind. I think it has to be borne in mind that, owing to the rather sharp electric shocks which have been received from various quarters lately, the nerves of Europe are at present rather highly strung, perhaps, more highly strung than the occasion really deserves. Also, I am sure, that so far as our own nerves are concerned, the best sedative is to maintain our strength, and if needs be to increase our strength. But I rather doubt whether such a statement as the noble Lord invites is calculated to be a sedative either to our own nerves or to the nerves of others; it might be indeed, to a certain extent, an irritant. One has to take a little into account the situation of the moment. The tension in the East, although it has been relaxed is not by any means over.

I may also remind your Lordships that an important debate recently took place in the German Reichstag, in which many important German politicians altogether disclaimed any feelings of hostility to this country. We may welcome those statements, and we may reciprocate the hope that friendship will take the place of any mutual suspicion which may have existed in the past; but at the same time no declarations of that kind can at all relieve us from the responsibility and duty of maintaining an efficient Army and Navy, although perhaps they do enjoin upon those who are responsible for the Government some degree of extra caution in the way of discussing the matter at this particular moment. Therefore, I venture to hope, if, as may be the case, the declarations from the Government Benches on this particular point are not quite so full and minute as the noble Earl may desire, that he will not press the point too strongly.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, I have no desire to enlarge the scope of this debate or to add any complications to the problem which the noble Earl has put before the Government, and I am well aware that it would be difficult to add anything to the very impressive speeches which have already been delivered, but I have this excuse for troubling your Lordships and occupying the attention of the House for a very few moments, that during the whole period of more than three years from its inception while I was a member of it the Defence Committee was engaged almost continuously on this question of invasion, and during nearly half that period I was responsible as Secretary of State for War for the measures taken for the land defence of the country. Therefore, I hope that I may be pardoned if I urge one or two points on the Government before the Secretary of State for the Colonies rises to reply. It has been shown very clearly to-night that there is a difference of opinion between naval and military experts as to the probabilities or possibilities of invasion. After all, that difference of opinion has existed for a long time. The optimism of naval experts is hereditary, and it has been up to the present justifiable. It existed in the days of Drake, it existed in the days of Nelson, and I believe that at the present moment the naval authorities are as convinced as their predecessors ever were that in all ordinary circumstances they would be able to prevent the landing of any considerable force on these shores, and that even the attempt would be attended with a degree of risk to the invaders which would cause it to be regarded as practically prohibitive.

But, my Lords, there is one subject and one aspect of this case which was not put before us by the noble and gallant Field-Marshal, and which he would, I know, be the first to recognise. Even if we look back only ten years, to go no further back, and take the two most recent instances in military and naval war, we see that these calculations are not part of an exact science, and we must be struck by the degree to which expert calculations were entirely disappointing. If we take land operations, for example, in our own war in South Africa, we must not forget that there was not a military authority in this country who did not under-estimate by thousands—I might even say by tens of thousands, almost by hundreds of thousands—the number of men whom we would be compelled to send to South Africa; or, if you take the Japanese War with Russia, I doubt if there was any naval authority in any part of the globe which would have foretold that the Japanese, in the face of a naval force equal to their own, if not in some respects in calibre superior, would have been able to ferry hundreds of thousands of troops across without interruption, with the exception, I think, only of a single day during the whole of the operations of the war; and when the great naval encounter came between the Japanese fleet and the Russian Baltic fleet, which resulted in practically the total destruction of the Russian fleet, the result of that conflict combined with the comparative immunity of the Japanese was probably unexpected, and came as a surprise to the whole of the civilised world. To all these elements of uncertainty and doubt in military and naval matters Lord Roberts has added to-night a contingency of surprise, a suggestion that I earnestly hope the Government will not rule out or put aside from their calculations as impossible, having regard to the fact, as Lord Roberts has shown us, that a larger force may be embarked than, from his calculations, might be needed to carry out the purpose, and bearing in mind also the rapidity with which in recent times we have seen crises arise and become acute between nations which have hitherto been friendly, and the immense stake which an invading enemy has to gain by anticipating by a few hours the formal declaration of war.

The noble Earl, Lord Cromer, has dealt with the final paragraph of Earl Roberts' Motion. There is no doubt that it would be difficult for any Government, and I am sure that nobody on this bench would press the Government at this moment to make a formal declaration in precise terms as to numbers, as to what may be apprehended or what number would be necessary in order to protect the country, or to divulge the confidence of the Defence Committee in that respect; but what I do ask the Government to do is, if they come to the conclusion that the calculations which the experts arrived at three years and a half ago, and on which Mr. Balfour's speech was based—and I may say in passing that I think it would come as a surprise to your Lordships, as it did to myself, to hear both from Lord Roberts and from Lord Lovat the paralysing effect which they attribute to that speech in regard to our land preparations, especially having regard to the fact that the whole of the scheme of the present Secretary of State has been debated in both Houses of Parliament in the interval, and to the best of my recollection Mr. Balfour's speech did not figure at all in those discussions—I say, leaving aside that, we all admit that there has been a great advance both as regards tonnage and the increased capacity of foreign ports, and also in the experience of the number of men who can be put on board according to the tonnage, that the danger and facilities for invasion have been increased, and if the Government hold, as they must hold, that in certain contingencies, the final struggle may be on land, I urge them to make a formal declaration to that effect to the House to-night. It is no use to cry safety if there is not safety. So long as the country believes that our Navy gives us absolute security from invasion, the country will look on with comparative apathy at the struggles of successive Secretaries of State to provide this country with a military system and an Army at home after the expeditionary force for the defence of our possessions abroad has left these shores. If you want to make a Territorial Army or any other organisation a reality, if you want to inculcate the necessary self-sacrifice among the youth of this country, if you want to raise military training beyond the level of competition in which it now is with cricket, football, and other desirable and, perhaps, more attractive athletic pursuits, you must tell the country the truth in this vital matter, and you must make the young men throughout the country realise that it is only by an organised, combined, and sustained effort that they can avoid the necessity of compulsory service for home defence as against the present voluntary effort. I feel that it is by this course alone that we can put an end to the ups and downs, the hot fits and cold fits, of military expenditure which have made all our attempts at military reorganisation futile up to the present moment, and which, besides costing us many large sums of money, have been the despair of our administrators and of our experts. I speak with some feeling about this matter, although the problem is one far removed from party welfare.

There is a point which I cannot help thinking specially bears on the speech we have heard to-night. Lord Roberts has told us that for our proper defence 1,000,000 men will be required. This is not the occasion to discuss that figure, but it occurred to me that nothing proves so conclusively the great advance in the opinion of Lord Roberts as to this danger, as the advance from the figure which he considered necessary five years ago, at the time when he was acting as Commander-in-Chief, to the figure which he thinks it necessary to press upon your Lordships to-night. I know that it is his belief that by a compulsory military training any figure of this kind can be obtained, but I am not going to press that question, although, perhaps, I might be allowed to say, in passing, that no compulsory military training, unless it is followed by compulsory military service, and unless the men so raised are equipped, enrolled, and a nucleus of them are with their regiments, will be of any assistance whatever in an emergency of the kind which he contemplates to-night.

But, my Lords, what is our position as compared with what it was, if it be the opinion of the Government that ultimately there may be some land struggle? After the South African War the country agreed to a scheme by which, after the Expeditionary Force of, say, 130,000 men had left these shores, 130,000 men were to be kept for service at home. Of those, Lord Roberts insisted that one-third should be Regulars, and that two-thirds of the artillery should be Regulars. Where are those Regulars now? This is far too important a question to argue on party grounds, but the policy recently adopted has denuded us of over 20,000 Regular troops, and the Reserve has been reduced by over 20,000 troops more by a War Office calculation, and, in the opinion of many 40,000 more, so that, at the very least, 40,000 to 50,000 less Regular troops are being maintained in this country than was the case three years ago. Does anybody know what the number of the decrease in officers has been during the same time? Your whole organisation for Home Defence depends upon the number of officers. The Regular Army is 500 officers shorter, and the Militia, already short of officers, have lost 500 officers during their transfer up to the present time, and the Volunteers, since the Territorial Army was established—although I hope this is not a lasting figure—have lost 2,500. So that at this moment there are 3,500 officers less with our forces than there were a few months ago, and I believe that our whole mobilisation must be affected by it. I do not wish to use any exaggeration; I know that the Government believe that by better training these forces will be more useful than a more numerous force. I do not wish to discourage, in any way, those who join the Territorial Army. I believe it would be most unpatriotic to do any such thing, and I believe that everyone of your Lordships has done what in him lay to assist our Territorial Army within his own district. But I make this statement with every sense of responsibility, and I appeal to every soldier in this House, to the gallant Field-Marshal, to Lord Grenfell, and to every man who has seen service. I have sat in the War Office for twelve years, and I have heard the opinion of every soldier of eminence who has served the Crown during that period in the higher ranks, and I say without fear of contradiction, that if instead of addressing your Lordships to-night, I were addressing an audience composed entirely of those officers, there is not one of them who would say that the Territorial Army without a stiffening of Regulars, even if it had been trained for two or three months on the outbreak of war, could possibly be pitted, the Regular Army being away, against the picked troops of a Continental Power. That stiffening of Regulars has been removed in the last few years, and under these circumstances I think it fair and right to ask the Government how they propose to deal with any of the problems which Lord Roberts and Lord Lovat have put before them this evening, and I feel, I confess, great anxiety as to the nature of that reply.

The highest authority on this matter is the Secretary of State for War. He made a speech on Friday last. In that speech he told a great audience that we were not only not weaker, but that by his policy we were 90,000 Regulars stronger than when he came into office, and he added that we had saved £2,500,000 with regard to them. I sincerely trust for the safety of this country that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will not call him to account for that £2,500,000 during the next few months, because I cannot help thinking that the Estimates will not be found to bear it out. How did he arrive at it? By quoting the present Reserve and by forgetting to take away any of the Reserve which must be reduced by the reduction of the Army—by crediting himself with all the Reservists of two or three years service which he is disbanding, and by adding to that 50,000 or 60,000 untrained Militiamen, Special Reservists with short training, all of whom he classes as Regular soldiers because they have signed on to serve abroad. But you can always make an account of this kind if you are willing to credit yourself with troops whom you are about to disband and to treat as trained soldiers men who have had about one-third or one-fourth or one-sixth of the training of Regular soldiers. And in the same spirit a few months ago Mr. Haldane told another audience that there was no fear in the matter of invasion, because no Government would send away the Regular troops abroad at a time when there was any fear of complications with other Powers.

Those are the sort of anæsthetics which I think a political doctor has no right to administer to his patients, and I am quite certain that the noble Earl opposite will not take refuge in such statements to-night. I have only intervened in this debate because those facts I think ought to be in the possession of the House before the reply is made. They emphasise, in my opinion, the necessity of a clear statement by the Government. Whatever the emergency is, it is undoubtedly less remote than it was a few years ago. I have tried to show that our powers of resistance to it have become less, we have gone backward when we ought to have gone forward, and I think it is indisputable that on previous occasions, when we have neglected the obvious teachings of experience, time has somehow been found in which to make up for those defects, but this is a case in which time will not be found, and the absence of it may be fatal to us. I do not wish, in any respect, to be a prophet of woe in this matter. I believe that a wise diplomacy may for a long time put off, or altogether obviate, any peril of this kind. It may be, and should be, only an off chance, but I do not think that any Member of this House will feel that the military preparations for safeguarding the heart of this Empire ought to rest on an off chance. It is for that reason, bearing in mind the recent emphatic declaration of the Prime Minister on the subject of naval defence, that I wish the Secretary of State for the Colonies to tell us to-night to what extent, in the opinion of his advisers, there is a peril on land, and to give us equally categorically and equally clearly as has been given to us with regard to our naval superiority, an undertaking that whatever the danger is, the Government will not hesitate to ask for the troops necessary to obviate it; thereby alone he can relieve the anxiety which will undoubtedly be found after the speech of Lord Roberts and it will also give us a security for the country in the future.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I think the House in general will agree that the noble and gallant Field-Marshal on the cross benches took a very serious step when he placed this Motion on the Paper, and the gravity of that step was not, I am afraid, diminished by the rather remarkable terms in which the Motion is couched, nor, I am still more sorry to say, was it in any degree diminished by the terms of the speech which he made. Parliamentary discussion of such a matter as this is a grave matter, because it is very difficult to conduct it in a way which may not give rise to serious misunderstanding outside, and I only trust that no such grave misunderstanding may be the result of this discussion to-day.

When on 11th May, 1905, Mr. Balfour made in another place the statement which has been already more than once alluded to this evening, my late right hon. friend Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman used some words which I would like to quote. He said—

> "At the same time, if I am to criticise—and I freely recognise that this is a subject in which to the utmost possibility of our power we ought to act together—I think the right hon. Gentleman's elaborate reference to the possibility of invasion by France was a little overdone. I admit that his statement would have lacked picturesqueness and the full satisfaction it gave to members of the Committee if this had been omitted. At the same time, his elaborate exposition of what would happen in a certain eventuality, which eventuality is of all others the one we least desire, and we hope the French people, at all events, least desire, may, in evil hands, and especially if dealt with by evil pens, do harm to the relations between the two countries—though not the official relations—and the feelings especially of the French people, towards us. I gladly say that I am sure the right hon. Gentleman had no such intention, and that the whole people of this country would share his desire. But we have seen, day after day, foolish speeches made, and quite recently in regard to another country; and although the right hon. Gentleman made it plain enough that he was only doing what was absolutely necessary in taking some concrete instances of possible invasion, yet I hope attention will be directed to the fact that he was not contemplating the likelihood of any such invasion and had no such suspicion in his mind."

The circumstances to-day are somewhat different from the circumstances of 1905, but I desire to reiterate and reduplicate that appeal—feeling as I do that if such an appeal is not made, consequences which we all should deplore in relation to public opinion both abroad and at home might not unnaturally follow the Motion and the speech of the noble and gallant Earl.

As regards Parliamentary discussion of these matters I can quote even a higher, if an older, authority. The Duke of Wellington, besides being a great military leader of his time, possessed what military leaders since his time have not perhaps as a rule possessed, except possibly the first Lord Hardinge, namely, a wide political experience and a deep sense of political responsibility. The Duke of Wellington during the thirties and forties perpetually appealed to succeeding Governments to do something towards the improvement of the national defence, which was at that time in a most deplorable condition. In 1847 he wrote his famous letter to Sir John Burgoyne, a letter which became public altogether against his wishes and to his great indignation. In the following year, the Duke of Wellington wrote to a person who had been concerned in the publication of the letter as follows—

> "Upon the subject of the defences of the country, I have formed and have given opinions to several administrations; but it is well known that my opinion has been that the subject would be considered with advantage by the Government alone in the first instance. The rules of procedure so require, and it is quite certain that the House of Lords, of which I am a Member, is the place in which it would be least advantageous to suggest a discussion on such a subject. It is well known that in the course of the last session of Parliament a discussion did take place in the House of Lords on the state of the defences of the country. Lord Ellenborough spoke; others spoke; I did not say one word. I objected to the movement on the part of any, excepting the servants of the Crown, and positively declared that I would not move in it. . . . My principal view in desiring to keep the subject in its regular channel was that I knew it was the only efficient one, and, moreover, the only safe one for the public interests."

That being so, although it is necessary for me to say something on this Motion, I propose to say as little as I possibly can, and in no case do I intend to attempt to touch on the purely military points that have been raised, and should the course of the debate indicate that it is desired that the specific question, for instance, raised by the noble Viscount who has just sat down, should be answered on this occasion, and not on some future occasion, my noble friend behind me the Under-Secretary for War will be happy to deal with that aspect of the matter.

As regards the terms of the Resolution, the noble and gallant Field Marshal makes a direct reference to the Committee of Imperial Defence, and the terms in which he does so I think are calculated to give a somewhat erroneous impression as to the functions and proceedings of that body. The Committee of Imperial Defence consists of the naval and military advisers of the

Crown acting in concert and acting together with some of the political advisers of the Crown for the time being. It resembles the Cabinet in so far as it is in perpetual although intermittent session, and it has to deal from time to time with points such as those contained in the noble and gallant Earl's Motion, and its views and its conclusions are of course subject to perpetual revision. It is, therefore, perfectly right to assume that the conclusions stated in Mr. Balfour's speech of May, 1905, must not be accepted as the last word on the matter. They are not absolute and final conclusions, and like others are subject to revision. It is perfectly true, as has been already pointed out in the course of the debate, that the conditions under which national defence has to be dealt with vary from time to time. Mr. Balfour in that speech mentioned the introduction of wireless telegraphy as one important factor. Since Mr. Balfour made that speech more than three years ago, wireless telegraphy has been brought to far greater perfection, and it is open to anybody to ask himself whether that is going to tell in favour of the attack or in favour of the defence.

Then again, there is another point to which allusion has been made by more than one speaker, that is as to the increase in the size and in the speed both of warships and of transports or of vessels which may be used as transports. Then there is the further development of submarines and the further development both of naval mines and of the means of rebutting attack by mines. All those and many other considerations have to be perpetually borne in mind by those who are responsible for considering how the country ought to be defended, and what I desire your Lordships to understand is that the process is a continuous and a perpetual one, and not merely carried out in consideration of any particular question being raised at any particular moment. On this question of invasion there may be said to be two extreme schools, one of which, according to the custom of attaching nicknames to everything in this country, has been spoken of as the dinghy school, namely, those who believe or who profess to believe that it is impossible that any foreign enemy, owing to the protection and the defence afforded by the Navy, could land in this country a boat's crew of the smallest capacity known at sea. I dismiss that theory, as Mr. Balfour, indeed, dismissed it in 1905. It is not, I think, an opinion that is held in its extreme form by any responsible person in the country, and no doubt it is perfectly true that if it were held there would be no necessity for any home army whatever; it is perfectly clear that if no enemy could ever land in any force on our shores, all the volunteer movement has been a mistake from beginning to end. Is that view in its extreme form held by anybody? Both the noble and gallant Earl and the noble Lord Lovat who followed him seemed to imply that that was the view indicated in Mr. Balfour's speech, and they held that speech as being responsible for the disinclination on the part both of officers and of men to join the Auxiliary Forces, and now the Territorial Army. Mr. Balfour is very well able to take care of himself, but I think, indeed, that that supposition was disposed of by what has been said by the noble Viscount who has just sat down, and it is disposed of still more by the fact that I think by common consent the interest and keenness shown in the raising of the Territorial Army has greatly exceeded anything which has been known in former years, although Mr. Balfour's statement still to a certain extent holds the field. Therefore, I do not believe that it can have been reasonably taken by anybody as implying that we had no need whatever of a home army.

At the other extreme comes the view which, if we have not heard it to its full extent to-night, is undoubtedly the view which has coloured both the speeches of the noble and gallant Earl and of Lord Lovat, namely, that for practical purposes we must not be regarded as an island in this matter of invasion, that we are to a very considerable extent in the position of a Continental Power, that is to say, that a very large army may cross our frontier at any given moment, and that consequently our means of defence must be designed more or less upon Continental lines. This theory of a Continental Army is pressed by some on other grounds. I do not believe that it is so pressed by the noble and gallant Earl, and we have heard nothing of those grounds in the course of to-night's debate, but I think it is pretty well-known that there are some who press this idea of a Continental Army not only with a view to defence but with a view to offence. It is held by some that the time has now arrived and that our Imperial conditions are such that we ought to take our place as a Continental Power, that is to say, that we ought to be able to throw into the field great masses of troops comparable to those which exist in the forces of the great Powers on the Continent of Europe.

LORD AMPTHILL: Who are those people?

THE EARL OF CREWE: Does the noble Lord desire me to name individuals?

LORD AMPTHILL: I should like to know who has expounded such an astonishing theory.

THE EARL OF CREWE: It has been most frequently stated.

LORD AMPTHILL: By whom?

THE EARL OF CREWE: If the noble Lord would read the literature on the subject he would find a great number of allusions to the point. I do not dwell upon that, because as I say that view is not as I believe held by the noble and gallant Earl.

LORD AMPTHILL: By whom is it held?

THE EARL OF CREWE: By a large number of persons. I need not say that, whoever that view is held by, I am glad to know it is not held by the noble Lord opposite. It is certainly not held by His Majesty's Government. There is an infinite variety of gradations between these two extreme views, although those who have spoken to-night and those who are responsible for the debate are certainly nearer to that view than to the extreme view of the blue water school, as it has been called.

In saying what I have to say, I desire, as far as possible, to keep clear of mentioning actual figures. It is very easy for those who are in no way responsible for the carrying on of public affairs to mention figures, be they large or be they small, but for those who are in any degree in a responsible position it is not desirable to tie down the Departments concerned by expressions of particular figures; and there is this further reason, that whenever you mention a particular figure you are liable to be asked and are asked, whether that is the exact figure. For instance, you may mention for a particular purpose, 50,000 men; you are then asked: "Does that mean, not 49,000 men; well, there is not any very great difference, will it mean not 45,000?" and so on, and so down to 40,000, and then the process begins again. So that it is very much wiser, I think, in discussing these matters, to speak in general terms. There are two clearly understood forms of attack which this country may be supposed to dread, one of which has been spoken of as an attack by raid, and the other as an attack by invasion. The distinction between the two is perfectly clear. I do not pretend to pin myself to the precise figure of a raid, although the noble Lord who left just now would undoubtedly be prepared to do so, but a raid, I take it, is an attack which is intended to cause damage or panic or diversion, but is not intended to secure the conquest of a country. By common consent, and there I believe we are all on common ground, it is generally agreed that an attack of that kind, or possibly more than one attack of that kind, might evade the Navy, whatever your naval strength may be and however admirably it is disposed.

Then we come to invasion, and I still mention no figures of invasion. It is perfectly well understood that by invasion is meant the landing of such an army on these shores as might conquer the country. That is what is meant by the figure mentioned by the noble and gallant Earl. With regard to that, I wish to say two things. I think it is perfectly true, as the noble Viscount has just stated, that in speaking of the army which is intended to defeat this large invading force when it arrives, to talk of military training is really unmeaning. You must encounter an army with an army, and your force, whatever it is, however large or however small, must be a complete force, infantry, cavalry and guns, although its proportion to the force that you could expect to have to meet may very reasonably depend upon the amount of actual training that it has received. Because if it was a mere question of training, or what is generally understood by training as distinct from service, the fact that a vast proportion of the men of the country had undergone that training, would not, I should have supposed, act as a deterrent to an invader, and if the invasion was of the sudden kind which has been contemplated by noble Lords, the force of such men could not be brought to bear to defeat it. Therefore, what the noble and gallant Earl asks for is 1,000,000 men who have undergone some period of military service. That, I think, is the first time that that great figure has been mentioned.

*EARL ROBERTS: Mr. Haldane mentioned 900,000 on one occasion.

THE EARL OF CREWE: At any rate, it is the first time, I think, that it has been mentioned in relation to the particular force which it is intended to meet—not as an ideal to aim at, but as a necessity in order to encounter a particular enemy who is expected to arise. The existence of that force, trained in the manner in which the Special Reserve is trained, which I believe is the demand made, would mean, I suppose, an addition of something like £20,000,000 a year to the Army Estimates, and without attempting to argue the point with the noble and gallant Field-Marshal as to whether that is necessary (of course, if it could be shown that it was necesssary to the existence of the nation, I have no doubt the nation would be prepared to meet the cost), I should just like to call the serious attention of the House to another consideration which arises out of that. We have not heard very much of the Navy during this debate. Slight lip service, if I may use the expression, is done to the Navy in the form of the Resolution, but I should just like to put to the House, what do they suppose will be the effect in the minds of the country of the acceptance to the full of this invasion theory as regards the Navy? It is a commonplace; it is common to all parties and to people of all political schools that we must have a paramount Navy. Everybody remembers Mr. Cobden's £100,000,000 statement. He was prepared to spend that if it could be shown that it was required. I believe at this moment that if it could be shown that the money was needed and that there was an assurance as there certainly would be at this moment, that the money would be well spent, there is practically no limit to the amount which the country would be willing to spend on naval defence. But do not imagine that that theory would last if the theories of the noble and gallant Field-Marshal and of the noble Lord, Lord Lovat, are accepted in full. I think it cannot possibly be disputed that a very large proportion of that willingness to spend money on the Navy depends on the existence of a belief in the minds of the people that, although the Navy may not possibly be able positively to guarantee them immunity from invasion, yet it offers them practical immunity, and if that belief is dissipated, as the acceptance of this Motion by the House would certainly tend to dissipate it, I should dread the effect on the public mind as regards the necessity for the maintenance of a paramount Navy. The Navy is not kept or desired to be kept at its present strength by the country merely in the belief that it will be able to fight a great and glorious action somewhere in mid-ocean, but it is undoubtedly kept and maintained at its present strength, which would be increased if necessary, in the belief that it is the Navy—I do not say the Navy alone, but the Navy mainly—which secures the defence of these shores; and that is above all others the reason not merely why I deprecate this discussion on the line which it has taken, but why I should deprecate infinitely more such a thing happening as the acceptance of the Motion in such terms by your Lordships' House.

Supposing, then, that we do not accept the theory of the noble and gallant Field-Marshal to the full, do we then belong to the dinghy school? Not in the least. We fully agree that it is necessary to have a home Army sufficiently strong and sufficiently organised in all its details. There are a number of reasons why this is an absolute necessity. In the first place, there is the minor function of repelling raids. I have bound myself to no figures with regard to raids, but I should be very sorry to bind myself to a very low figure, and if it is necessary that one or more raids of considerable size should be encountered and overwhelmed at once, as would be necessary, you would no doubt require both a powerful and a well organised force at home. Then again, there is an absolute necessity of preventing panic at home, and that can only be carried out by the existence of a powerful home Army, all the more because the existence of panic might undoubtedly have the effect which was, I think, mentioned by the noble Lord, Lord Lovat, that public opinion might hamper the action of the Admiralty in using the Fleet to the best advantage, by practically making it impossible to send from our shores such a number of ships as might indeed quite safely and properly be sent.

Then again, there is the problem that your home defence force must be such as to compel your enemy to come in very great strength indeed. That is no new theory, and I may again perhaps be allowed to quote a few words from my late right hon. friend Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the same debate. He said—

> "What has always seemed to me the proper policy in regard to the defence of this country is to see that our force is sufficient not only to overcome the smallest number who might, in any circumstances, be thrown upon our shores, but that there should be so much additional strength as will compel the foreign Power to contemplate sending a larger force than 70,000."

—there Sir Henry adopted the figure mentioned by Mr. Balfour, but it must not be taken, I think, as being a governing figure. I now quote again—

> "And, therefore, put it out of the question that they should come at all. The way to prevent invasion is to have within limits overwhelming force such as would compel the invader, if he is to come at all—I am going to put it in an Irish way—to come with such force that he will not come."

The meaning of that is that if you can compel the enemy to come with a sufficiently large force, the task of the Admiralty in intercepting him on his way is proportionately facilitated, and if you can compel him to come with a convoy which must necessarily cover a large portion of the sea and, of course, before he starts to make preparations on a very large scale, you can (although there are no certainties in these matters—there I entirely agree) make the task of the Admiralty in meeting and destroying a fleet so comparatively easy that the approximate certainty, if I may so put it, is that the attempt will not be made.

Consequently, my Lords, in spite of all that has been said by the noble Earl, we do not abandon our reliance on the general power of the Navy to deal with invasion by a great force. At the same time it is perfectly true that it is impossible to announce an absolute guarantee against the landing on these shores of even an invading force; all you can ask for is what I spoke of before a reasonable and practical immunity such as you find satisfactory in human affairs generally. But you are obliged, for the various reasons I have stated, to have a large and powerful force at home, distinct from the question as to whether your invading force will land or not. Having got it, it is absolutely right and wise to organise it in such a manner that should an invasion take place, however remote the possibility of invasion may be, you would be in a position to meet it, and I am given to understand that the General Staff of the Army have been at work for some time past on schemes which will make it possible to throw the largest possible force to any point at a time when it may be needed. I do not propose to enter into figures of the different possibilities which may occur. Of course a great deal depends on the extent to which the country at any given moment is denuded of its Regular forces. In considering this matter, you must assume, of course, that things are at their worst in the matter of the absence of the Regular Army from our shores, and equally in matters of good fortune and of good management, and into these details I do not propose to go. The specific points as to the present position and means both of the Regular Army and of the Territorial Force, which were raised by the noble Viscount Midleton, will, if desired, be dealt with by my noble friend the Under-Secretary, who is far more competent to deal with them than I am.

I would merely say this in conclusion, that I do ask the House to believe that we are as completely convinced as any noble Lord can possibly be, of the necessity of having an organised system of defence. At the same time, we do not accept to the full the conclusions of the noble and gallant Field-Marshal and of the noble Lord opposite, and consequently we are not prepared to do what we should have to do, if we accepted them, namely, to revolutionise both our theory and our practice not merely with regard to the military, but with regard to the naval defence of this country.

LORD GRENFELL: My Lords, in the very few remarks that I intend to make this evening I do not propose in any way to go into the question of invasion or not invasion; the two noble Lords have already dealt with that subject. But before I go to the remarks which I did intend to make, perhaps I might say one word on the speech of the Leader of the Government, who has just sat down. I think we are all rather astonished to find that a force of which at present we have no knowledge exists for the repelling of a large invasion, I take it up to 70,000 strong. It must be remembered that no possibility of invasion exists as long as difficulties do not occur abroad, and as long as our troops are not diverted from England, and as long as we are able to concentrate the men of the Regular Armies together with the Territorial Army at any point to meet an invasion. But our point is that at some period the Regular Army may be diverted, as it was during the late South African campaign, and that at that time when this large expeditionary force which has eluded our Fleet or has sunk our Fleet reaches the shores of England, the only assistance to the Territorial Forces will be the recruits, the cadres of depots, and the men of the Army of under one year's service. Those, as far as we know, would be the only men available to meet this very formidable invasion.

I propose to mention to your Lordships a certain moribund Commission which sat some years ago, and of which I think sufficient notice has not been taken. I am glad to say that there has been no severe criticism of the Territorial system. We believe, I think, in the Army that as far as the organisation goes, it is a vast improvement on what we have had in past years. But what we do criticise are the details. We criticise the want of training, and what the noble Field-Marshal criticised so very strongly is felt throughout the Army, that it will be almost an impossibility to make an efficient horse artillery and field artillery out of what we get by so very short a period of training. The question is whether this force will be sufficient in numbers and whether it will be efficient to meet foreign troops of a first-class order. The Commission known as the Norfolk Commission sat in 1903. It was presided over by His Grace the Duke of Norfolk. On it sat the late Lord Derby, the Duke of Richmond and Sir Ralph Knox, and the evidence of the best Volunteer and Militia officers they could collect in the country was given before them. That Commission sat for seven or eight months; it examined over 140 witnesses, and I venture, though I fear I shall be troubling you, to read some extracts calling attention to the work done by that Commission. When we started, we asked for certain documents from the War Office and the Admiralty. The first document that was furnished by the War Office was a Memorandum entitled "The Organisation of the Auxiliary Forces considered in relation to the Military Defence of the Empire," and the Report says—

> "We were informed by the Director-General of Mobilisation and Military Intelligence that it might be taken as an expression of the views of the Secretary of State for War and of the Commander-in-Chief, but that it had not been considered by the Committee of Imperial Defence."

And some months after we had been sitting discussing this document, we were told that this must not be taken as authoritative. In this Memorandum the total number of troops stated to be available required for Home defence was estimated at 320,000, of which 150,000 were mobile, 120,000 in England and 30,000 in Ireland. In the total of 330,000, one-fifth, 66,000, were to be

Regulars. The remaining four-fifths were to be found by the Militia, the Imperial Yeomanry, and Volunteers. We were informed that the troops left available for the defence of the country on the mobilisation of these troops would be made up as I mentioned just now of the cadres of depots, the recruits, and the men under one year's service. The Memorandum continues—

> "The strength of the hostile force which, having regard to the existing balance of sea power, could be landed in this country is a matter on which there is a diversity of opinion. It is held by some that the Navy can guarantee the complete protection of the United Kingdom against the danger of invasion by any larger force than from 5,000 to 10,000 men."

We were informed by the Director-General of Mobilisation and Intelligence that this was the view of the Admiralty. But it is evident that a defensive army of 330,000 men, of which 150,000 are to be mobile, points to something more serious than raids of 5,000 to 10,000 men. It seemed desirous that we should obtain information direct from the Admiralty, and our noble Chairman then applied to the Admiralty and invited the Director of Naval Intelligence to attend and give evidence before us on this question of the force which might reasonably be expected to invade this country. This is what the Report says—

> "We, as early as 20th May, 1903, invited the Director of Naval Intelligence to attend and give evidence before us in answer to a series of questions, the purpose of which was to ascertain what, in his judgment, were the possible or probable conditions of a landing in the United Kingdom, the strength which a force so landed might be reasonably expected to have, and the time which might be available for preparations to meet it after a declaration of war or after an outbreak of hostilities."

We were unable to obtain this information. We received a letter from the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty stating—

> "They could not permit the Director of Naval Intelligence to give us his evidence."

No doubt there was good reason for that, but still our Commission was placed in rather an unfortunate position. We had one estimate from the War Office and we had another from the Admiralty. Accordingly the Commission addressed to the Committee of Imperial Defence the questions contained in the Duke of Norfolk's letter of the 26th May, inquiring what were, in the judgment of the Committee, the maximum and minimum limits of an invading force, and whether it was contemplated that the duty of resisting this force would fall mainly on the Auxiliary Forces. That was a very important question for us. Our terms of reference were to report as to the best means of increasing the efficiency of the Force and also the keeping up of the number of the Force. Therefore, as I said before, we applied to the Committee of Imperial Defence. On the 22nd June, 1903, the President of the Committee of Imperial Defence communicated to the Duke of Norfolk a Memorandum to the effect that the Commissioners were not intended to inquire into the numbers which should be maintained either for home defence or other services, this question having been for some time, and being then, under consideration by the Committee of Defence. Again that placed us in rather a difficult position. Those questions therefore being closed we went on with our work. We examined witnesses and went into various questions, geographical questions, as to the possibility of landing or not, and we got the military opinions of the best officers of Militia and Volunteers that then existed. The further questions being closed, the Commission asked to be furnished with a copy of the mobilisation scheme, and in reply received a further communication dated 5th August, 1903, from the Committee of Defence, in which it was stated—

> "The Committee of Defence think that it will meet the purpose of the inquiry if the Duke of Norfolk's Commission will base their recommendations on the assumption that the mobilisation scheme for Home Defence will be met by an effective force of 100,000 Militia and 200,000 Volunteers."

This is another figure that we received—

> "It is to be understood, as already stated, that these figures do not necessarily represent those which the Committee of Imperial Defence will eventually adopt, and that they are only put forward as a basis from which the Royal Commission may prosecute their inquiries."

The Report goes on—

> "Your Commission has received no further communication from the Committee of Defence and has no knowledge of any decision to which the Committee may have come on the subject of the conditions of possible invasion or of the number of troops required to repel it.

> "It will be seen that we had not the means of reaching in any scientific manner an independent conclusion as to the adequate strength to be provided and have had no authoritative estimate of that strength. We, therefore, assumed as the basis of our inquiry, so far as numbers are concerned, the figures given us by the Committee of Defence, which correspond in substance with those given us by the Secretary of State for War. Neither the estimate given us by the War Office of a force of 330,000 men, in which are included 150,000 mobile troops, nor that given us by the Committee of Defence of an effective force of 100,000 Militiamen and 200,000 Volunteers besides, presumably, the Imperial Yeomanry, can be reconciled with the assumption that this country can rely for its defence against invasion solely on the Navy. Each of them points to protection against attack more formidable than a raid by 5,000 or 10,000 men. An effective force—in other words, an Army—of the strength proposed to us, can be required only to meet an invasion. Either invasion is possible or it is not. If not, no military force is required for home defence, and our inquiry could hardly serve any practical purpose. But if invasion is possible, it can be undertaken only by one of the great European Powers which possess forces highly trained and ready to move in large numbers at the shortest notice."

I have troubled you with these quotations from this Commission, because I think it is a Commission whose Report is worth looking at and studying. It was very carefully drawn up; an enormous amount of trouble was taken by the noble Chairman and the members of the Commission, and a very large number of witnesses were examined. We sat, as I said, for several months; we got every possible evidence that we could, and eventually the Report of the Commission was this—

> "That a home-defence Army, capable in the absence of the whole or the greater portion of the Regular Forces for protecting this country against invasion can be raised and maintained only on the principle that it is the duty of every citizen to be trained for national defence and to take part in it should emergency arise."

It is a curious fact that, of the eleven members when the Commission commenced, I do not think more than two were men who were committed in any way to the opinion of the necessity of national training, and when the Commission ended, nine of the members concurred in this opinion; one, Sir Ralph Knox, did not concur entirely, and the other two members objected. This Commission was received with coldness by the Government and was somewhat ignored by the Press, but it was welcomed by a great many; it was welcomed by the officers of the Army; it was welcomed by the officers of the Navy, who saw through it a chance of their Fleet's being able to perform their duty where it was required, and not remaining tied to the shores of England. Some of its recommendations were adopted and now exist in the Territorial scheme. Political reasons will no doubt hinder the immediate adoption of what we desire, but public opinion is greatly changing and I believe that should this national training ever be adopted (and I may mention on that point, as the noble Lord has quoted the letter of the Duke of Wellington to Sir John Burgoyne that in that letter he states the absolute futility of attempting to defend the country by an untrained force) it will prevent the plans of invasion being even considered by any foreign Power, that it will stop the physical deterioration of our race, and that it will free the Fleet and allow the British citizen with a war existing to sleep quietly in his bed.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble and gallant Field-Marshal on the cross benches began his speech, to which, I am sure, we all listened with the utmost interest, with the somewhat pathetic observation that he feared his efforts to direct the attention of this House to the necessity of strong measures of home defence had hitherto fallen upon stony ground. I think, if I may venture to say so, my noble and gallant friend takes a rather pessimistic view of the success which he has himself achieved, because I have no doubt whatever that the speeches which he has delivered in this House and elsewhere have done more than any other speeches to interest the public in these important subjects and to induce us to give them the attention they deserve.

The main object of my noble and gallant friend was to obtain from His Majesty's Government a definite statement that they no longer hold to the position defined by Mr. Balfour in 1905. I must say that Mr. Balfour's exposition of the then policy of the Defence Committee has been sometimes not very reasonably interpreted. Mr. Balfour said nothing to suggest that in his opinion a strong home Army was superfluous. Indeed, the whole of his argument was based upon the assumption that a strong home Army did exist, and his reasoning was this—If you have a sufficiently strong home Army no foreign enemy will attempt to invade your shores except in considerable force; if your enemy does come in considerable force, his difficulties in transporting that force will grow in proportion to the magnitude of the body of troops he has to ferry across the sea, and for these reasons—that was Mr. Balfour's conclusion—this country has to reckon, or had then to reckon, rather with what we commonly speak of as raids than with the problem of invasion by a large army. But I am quite sure that neither Mr. Balfour nor the members of the then Defence Committee had any idea of suggesting that the conclusions of that Committee were to be taken as the laws of the Medes and Persians and never to be reconsidered or modified by the light of subsequent experience.

It is indeed obvious, and this has been fully admitted by the noble Earl who leads the House, that the conditions of the problem are continually altering. You have new inventions, greater facilities for concentrating troops, greater facilities for carrying them across the seas, new modes of navigating the sea, and, indeed, of navigating the air, wireless telegraphy—you have all these things, and I am glad, therefore, to take note of the fact that up to this point His Majesty's Government are ready to concede freely that the problem of invasion has undergone very great changes; that—I think I am quoting the expression that fell from the noble Earl—the last word has certainly not been said, and that these schemes of defence at this moment require and are undergoing careful revision. I do not know whether the noble Earl went quite so far as to admit—perhaps I do him an injustice—that the conditions of the problem have changed very much to our disadvantage since Mr. Balfour made that speech in 1905. That, however, is the main point made by my noble and gallant friend, and I am bound to say I think he has thoroughly established that point, and I should have been glad if the noble Earl opposite had been able to concede rather more fully that this was so.

The noble and gallant Earl, relying on the speech made by Mr. Balfour in 1905, asks His Majesty's Government to lay before this House a similar statement, giving similar information, with regard to the problem as it presents itself at the present time. I am bound to admit that His Majesty's Government have reason on their side when they say that the precedent of 1905 should not be pushed too far. I do not think anyone who has had to do with this question would go the length of saying that it is the duty of the Government of the day to take this country, or, we may say, to take the whole world, into its confidence with regard to the details of these vital problems of Imperial defence. The extent of the revelations which are admissible in regard to such matters must vary very much with the circumstances of the moment, and I fully concede that the circumstances of the present day differ considerably from the circumstances when Mr. Balfour made his speech in 1905. I thought my noble friend on the cross benches, Lord Cromer, put the matter very appositely when he said that at this moment the international nerves were rather highly strung, and for that reason I should certainly be cautious how I encouraged any statements which might add to the tension which already exists. But, my Lords, although we do not claim that such a statement should be made in detail, we are, I think, certainly entitled at any rate to some general statement from His Majesty's Government as to their view of the extent to which the conditions which prevailed in 1905 have been affected by subsequent events.

The noble Earl who leads the House, feeling, I think, that something of the kind was expected from him, made a considerable effort to give us some at any rate of the information for which we were waiting. But, if he will forgive me for saying so, he did not take us very far. He reminded us that the country was in the habit of looking to the existence of a powerful Fleet to secure it immunity from invasion. That is all very well. We should all of us, I hope, regard the Fleet as our first line of defence, but my noble friend Lord Midleton reminded the House of examples of those vicissitudes of naval warfare which we cannot exclude from calculation and which have had the effect of depriving for the moment, or even permanently, a great Power of the superiority which it might have expected from its normal predominance in naval strength. And may I venture to remind the House of a new and, to my mind, a somewhat disquieting feature which now enters into these calculations? There seems to be a disposition to speculate in ironclads. Enterprising shipbuilders build two or three immensely powerful ships of war and sell them to a minor Power, perhaps a South American Power. These vessels come into the market, and the acquisition of one or two of them may at any moment entirely upset the reckoning and destroy the naval balance towards which you have been carefully working.

But one thing I think I certainly gathered from the noble Earl. He told us that, in his view, a large and powerful home Army should be maintained, and I think he said an Army strong enough to compel the enemy to invade us in force. Therefore, I think we may rank the noble Earl amongst those who do not exclude the idea of a *coup de main*, on these shores, and not only a *coup de main*, but a *coup de main* in considerable force such as could not by any use of language be described merely as a comparatively insignificant raid. The noble Earl went on to tell us that, in view of this possibility, a scheme had been prepared under which the military authorities would maintain a force available for this purpose, and sufficiently strong to meet the attack. I think that was the general tone of his argument.

THE EARL OF CREWE assented.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I am glad I do not misinterpret the noble Earl. It would, I think, be rather reassuring to us if the noble Earl had been able to tell us something as to the nature and composition of this force. I do not press him for details. I think it would be unfair to ask him for precise figures, but I did not gather from his speech one iota of information as to the materials of which this defensive force was to be composed. We know what the available materials are. There is, to begin with, the Territorial Army. My noble and gallant friend dealt with that. He told us, and I do not think he was contradicted, that there would be, in round figures, 200,000 of these Territorial troops available, and he argued, and again I do not think he was challenged, that the whole of these men would be wanted to occupy garrisons and defensive positions. Where therefore is the balance of the Territorial troops available to form part of this defensive force which is to be in readiness to deal with a *coup de main*? I do not say any more as to the quality of the Territorial troops. I rejoice to believe that the class of men who are enrolling themselves is very satisfactory, and that in many parts of the country an admirable and useful body of troops is being brought into existence. But I have never found any soldier who was ready to admit that a force composed entirely of Territorial troops would be fit to deal with a landing consisting obviously of the most picked men whom a foreign Power could select for the purpose.

My noble and gallant friend says he must have 1,000,000 of Territorial troops to deal with this problem of invasion. I gathered from his speech that he would work them into the framework which Mr. Haldane has contrived; but would these new troops, any more than the present soldiers of the Territorial Army, be fit to take the field at a moment's notice against a picked body of invaders? I confess it would surprise me to hear the noble and gallant Earl tell the House so. They would, of course, be invaluable for the purposes of a prolonged war and for making good the wastage of the Army; but I should have thought that for the purposes of a great national emergency they would hardly be the material on which we should be likely to depend at a few days notice. That brings me to the Regular Army. I shall always believe that if you are to have a compact body of troops ready at a moment's notice to hold its own against an invading force, it is to the Regular Army that you must, at all events in the first instance, look. Well, the Regular Army is not intended to be always kept at home, and I think the noble and gallant Earl has told us that when the expeditionary force has left these shores there will be no Regular troops remaining for the purposes of home defence. That is a very serious point.

My noble friend Lord Midleton reminded the House that in his time, after the expeditionary force had left the country we had a great body of with Auxiliary troops a substantial stiffening of Regular soldiers still left for the purpose of home defence. That is gone now, and that is the point on which I venture to think His Majesty's Government are most open to criticism. They have, as Lord Cromer told the House, carried out the process of destruction before they accomplished the process of construction. They have got rid of, I think, 20,000 Regular soldiers, and I think the ultimate loss of the Reserve of the Regular Army will be between 30,000 and 40,000. They have got rid of an immense number of officers, and thereby they have weakened what ought to be the mainstay of this country, not only for hostilities abroad, but also for Home defence. It seems to me that His Majesty's Government should ask us not merely to be content with a powerful Fleet or with a Regular Army strong enough to give us an expeditionary force, but that we should have besides a sufficient nucleus of Regular troops to carry out the stiffening of the larger body of less fully trained troops which are always to be found at home.

I pass for one moment to the Resolution of the noble and gallant Earl. I cannot help doubting whether he is altogether wise in asking us to resolve that His Majesty's Government should be called upon to make a full statement on the invasion problem, and to state definitely the conclusions arrived at as the result of the recent inquiry by the Committee of Imperial Defence. If His Majesty's Government think it against public policy to communicate those conclusions I do not think we ought to press them to do so. I would, therefore, suggest to my noble and gallant friend that he should not ask the House to divide upon the concluding part of his Resolution. If he contents himself with the earlier portion—

> "That in the opinion of this House the defence of these islands necessitates the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government to the provision, in addition to a powerful Navy, of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores—"

I am perfectly ready to vote with him if he divides the House; and I should be rather surprised if His Majesty's Government did not accept that part of the noble Earl's Motion, because it follows very closely the Resolution which this House passed and passed unanimously in 1905. I cannot conceive that His Majesty's Government should declare to the country that the defence of these islands does not necessitiate the provision, in addition to a powerful Navy, of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that a foreign nation would hesitate to attack us. That was, unless I misunderstood the noble Earl, exactly what he told us half-an-hour ago should be the bedrock of our policy and I shall be surprised if he votes against a Resolution which does no more than re-affirm that policy.

THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, as the noble Marquess has directly alluded to what I said, I think I must, by the leave of the House, explain the reasons for which it appears impossible to His Majesty's Government to accept the Motion in those terms. There is one reason which I confess weighs strongly with me. In the case of an Act of Parliament it is perfectly true that the speeches by which the particular clauses of the Act are introduced and supported have no effect upon the interpretation of the Act in a Court of law afterwards, but when one comes to accepting a Motion it is rather a different thing. I think the Motion before the House must be read in conjunction with the speech of the noble and gallant Earl and with the proposals which he indicated. I do not know but that some day noble Lords opposite may be sitting on these benches, and if they are then told that they have committed themselves by the acceptance of this

Motion to the provision of a home Army of 1,000,000 men I am afraid they will find themselves in a somewhat inconvenient position. I cannot dissociate this Motion from the speech of the noble and gallant Earl; and it seems to me hardly courteous to him, and hardly reasonable as far as we are concerned, that we should be asked to do so. Of course, if it is merely intended to pass a platonic Resolution that we ought to have a strong Army as well as a strong Navy, and everybody is allowed to put their own construction on what is meant, it is a simple enough matter to pass a Motion of that kind. Another reason why the Government could not accept this Motion is that it does involve something in the nature of a vote of censure upon us. It does not say the maintenance of an Army; it asks us to "provide" an Army—that is to say, it calls upon us to alter our present scheme of defence and substitute for it something else. We can hardly be expected to accept a proposition of that kind. A third reason why we cannot accept the Motion is that as it stands it does appear to me to involve the full acceptance of the proposition that the Navy must not be regarded as much of a safeguard against invasion, and of the view so powerfully advanced by the noble and gallant Earl that it is to the Army, and, in the last resort, to the Army alone, that you must look for defence against invasion. I have given three reasons, and I am afraid any one of them would prevent our accepting this Motion.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, with regard to what has just fallen from the noble Earl, I do not think it is quite correct to assume that we are voting upon a speech. Surely we are voting upon the actual terms of the Resolution before the House; and if any one will take the pains to read the Resolution we are asked to pass now and also the one which your Lordships' House unanimously passed on 10th July, 1905, I think he will find that there is very little difference between them—in fact, it appears to me that, having voted for the one, it is only logical to vote for the other. The noble Earl seemed to think that we were laying down for the first time that we could not rely entirely upon the Navy against raids and attacks. The Resolution which your Lordships passed on 10th July, 1905, ran as follows—

> "That in the opinion of this House, it would be a danger to the Realm, and limit the power of the Navy as an offensive force in war, to trust to it alone for Home defence, and, inasmuch as it is admitted that the Navy cannot guarantee us against so-called hostile 'raids,' it is the more needful that our land defences should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores."

THE EARL OF CREWE: What I said was that we were now laying down the proposition that the Navy could not be regarded as a defence against invasion, not against raids.

EARL CAWDOR: I do not think we are laying that down at all. We are practically making very much the same statement as was made on the previous occasion. I do not see anything in the Resolution that puts forward that the Navy is less efficient to protect us against invasion than we considered it to be in 1905, and I hope your Lordships will support the Resolution.

*VISCOUNT MILNER: My Lords, at this late hour I shall not detain your Lordships for more than a few minutes, but I do sincerely hope that the noble and gallant Field Marshal will persist with his Motion and not reduce it to what might appear to be a mere platitude. Though I do not altogether like the form of the Motion, I should be happy to have the opportunity of going into the lobby with the noble and gallant Earl, even if I were to go with him alone, in order to record my protest, at any rate, against the eternal shilly-shallying of this Government, and all Governments, on the vital question of the adequacy of our land forces for the defence of this country.

A great deal has been said to-night about our responsibility in discussing such a question at a moment when international relations are somewhat disturbed. I hope that it is not only the occupants of the front benches who may be supposed to feel the responsibility of discussing a matter of this kind. Personally, I have had some experience, although I have never occupied a position of that dignity, in moments of grave national danger, and it is with the gravest sense of responsibility that I now speak a few words in this debate. I sincerely hope that the noble and gallant Earl will go on with his Motion and that the result of the discussion which has taken place to-night may be something more serious and more effective than has been the case with of other discussions of this character.

We are told of the difficulty which the Government feel in speaking frankly about the condition of the national defences at a time like the present. If any one attempts to raise the question of the efficiency of our land defences at a time when the international horizon is clear, he is pooh-poohed as an alarmist. If any one discusses the subject at a time when the horizon is clouded he is pushed aside as a mischief-maker whose interference is calculated to make things worse. I do not believe for a moment that a manly and business-like nation like the Germans would object to anything which was said by the noble and gallant Earl this evening. Neither do I see why any nation should feel so sensitive about a discussion as to the relative strength of armies, when no such feeling is aroused by the discussion of the relative strength of navies. And yet it is just with regard to our land defences that it is most necessary to arouse the interest of the country, having regard to their present insufficient condition. There seems to be some fatality which prevents every successive Government from dealing with the matter of our land forces, especially our second line of defence, in a manner which is calculated to give an impression that it takes the matter seriously.

I should like to put, very briefly, what the difficulty is which presses upon some laymen who have given a good deal of thought to this matter. I suppose everyone can conceive circumstances—they might arise any day—which would call for the withdrawal of our Regular Army and its Reserves for the defence of our over-sea Possessions. Those, surely, are just the circumstances under which any European Power which had accounts to settle with us would think that the moment had come in which to settle them; and, in the absence of the Regular Army, what is going to be our protection? I suppose that it is with a view to a contingency of that kind that the second line of defence has been called into existence. But I am beginning to feel a total inability to understand what is the place in any coherent system of national defence which in the opinion of the responsible authorities allotted to the Territorial Army. Is it to be sufficient to protect the country, in the absence of the Regular Army, in circumstances which might easily arise, as they did arise, for example, at the time of the Boer War? I thought that was its object. I certainly understood that that was the object which the Secretary of State for War had in view when he spoke in eloquent and impressive terms of the necessity of a citizen Army, mentioning the figure of 900,000 men as being not an excessive number of trained citizens for the defence of this country. Between that and the provision of 200,000 or 300,000 men, if we can get them, trained not like the Regular armies on the Continent, not like the Swiss Militia, which does constitute an effective fighting force, but trained for fourteen days during one or two years—how vast the difference! If there is a possibility of the Regular Army being removed from the country, I cannot understand how people can feel any confidence in the capacity of the Territorial Army as at present constituted to defend us against invasion.

It is too late in the evening to go at greater length into this matter; nor do I believe that your Lordships wish this discussion to be prolonged. But, taking to heart, as I do very seriously, the warnings which have been uttered by the noble and gallant Earl, I feel that I am bound to enter my protest against this discussion ending in so pointless a manner as either the withdrawal of the Motion or the acceptance of a merely formal Resolution. I am one of those who believe, and believe most earnestly, that a very great change has to be made, and made soon, in the condition of our land forces, if this country is to be in anything like a position of security; and I should be very sorry if the opportunity which this discussion to-night affords were lost for impressing the depth of the conviction which some of us feel on that subject upon the minds of the people of this country.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I only rise for the purpose of putting a very respectful question to my noble and gallant friend who has made so notable a speech this evening. I would call his attention to the fact that his Motion as it stood upon the Paper for many days did not include the last paragraph. That has been a comparatively recent addition, and upon that last paragraph we have the definite statement made on behalf of His Majesty's Government by the noble Earl, speaking with a full sense of responsibility, that it is not a Resolution with which they can comply having regard to the public interests. Thereupon my noble friend who has recently been responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs, and who speaks with immense authority both in this House and in the country, stated to your Lordships that, after that declaration on the part of the Government, it would be, in his opinion, improper to press them any further. I cannot doubt, therefore, that the majority of your Lordships would wish not to press the last paragraph of the Motion. As regards the earlier paragraph—that is to say, the original Motion which Lord Roberts placed on the Paper—my noble friend Lord Lansdowne has stated that he is prepared to support it, and I would venture very respectfully to ask, on his behalf, what the noble and gallant Earl proposes to do.

EARL ROBERTS: My Lords, I am quite ready to adopt Lord Lansdowne's suggestion and to withdraw the last paragraph of my Motion.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I had no intention of obtruding myself upon your notice to-night, but I wish to express to my noble and gallant friend who brought forward this Motion my grateful thanks for the course he has taken. It is a great public act on his part, and the nation ought to be grateful to him for putting this vital question so forcibly and in such a practical way before the attention of Parliament. I own to not having heard, through my deafness, all that has been said in this debate; but it was with astonishment that I learned that the Government were going to resist this Motion. In so doing they are acting absolutely inconsistently with what they did three years ago. For what did they do three years ago? Both sides of the House unanimously adopted a Resolution practically the same as that which has to-day been moved by my noble and gallant friend. In that Resolution the House agreed that we could not trust to the Navy alone, and that it was our duty to put our land defences in such a state that no nation would ever attempt in any form a hostile landing on our shores. I say, therefore, that the course which the Government propose to take upon the noble and gallant Earl's Motion is inconsistent with that Resolution. I should have thought the Government and the Opposition would have stretched out hands and agreed together upon a matter which is for the safety as well as the existence of the Empire. Noble Lords on both sides know what should be done and ought to agree; and I protest against the action of the Government in resisting the patriotic Motion of my noble and gallant friend.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): As I understand, the noble and gallant Earl omits the second paragraph of his Motion?

EARL ROBERTS: Yes.

LORD LOREBURN: I will read the Resolution as amended and in the form in which it is proposed to be put to the House. The Resolution runs—

> "That in the opinion of this House, the defence of these islands necessitates the immediate attention of His Majesty's Government to the provision (in addition to a powerful Navy) of an Army so strong in numbers and so efficient in quality that the most formidable foreign nation would hesitate to attempt a landing on these shores, and thus give practical effect to the Resolution unanimously agreed to by the House on 10th July, 1905."

On Question, "That the Resolution be agreed to."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 74; Not-contents, 32.

CONTENTS.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Argyll, D.
Bedford, D.
Wellington, D.

Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.

Bathurst, E.
Brownlow, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cawdor, E.
Cromer, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Lauderdale, E.
Londesborough E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mayo, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Northbrook, E.
Plymouth, E.
Roberts, E. [*Teller*]
Scarbrough, E.

Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E.

Churchill, V.
Colville of Culross, V.
Falkland, V.
Falmouth, V.
Goschen, V.
Hampden, V.
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Milner, V.
Ridley, V.

Amherst of Hackney, L.
Ampthill, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Balfour, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Belper, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Colchester, L.
Collins, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Ellenborough, L.
Fairlie, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Grenfell, L.

Hatherton, L.
Hindlip, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Loch, L.
Lovat, L. [*Teller*]
Middleton, L.
Monckton, L. (*V. Galway.*)
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
Poltimore, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Rosmead, L.
Seaton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Tennyson, L.
Tweeddale, L. (*M. Tweeddale.*)
Wandsworth, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Wolverton, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Wolverhampton, V. (*L. President.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Carrington, E.
Liverpool, E.

Althorp, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
Esher, V.

Morley of Blackburn, V.
Selby, V.

Armitstead, L.
Blyth, L.
Brassey, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. [*Teller.*]
Eversley, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller*]

Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Hemphill, L.
Lochee, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
MacDonnell, L.
Marchamley, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Pirrie, L.
Reay, L.
St. Davids, L.
Saye and Sele, L.

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 23rd November, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Landore; Loughor; Neath; Port Talbot; and Taibach; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) ACT, 1907.

Copies presented, of Regulations made by the Local Government Board: (1) Regulations as to Foreign Meat; (2) Regulations as to Unsound Food [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of the Annual Local Taxation Returns for 1906–7. Part I. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 333.]

AFRICA (No. 5, 1908).

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence respecting the Taxation of

Natives and other questions in the Congo State [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4171 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 670 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th July; *Sir William Bull*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 334.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Scheme for a new Teachers' Registration Council [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of an Order, No. 7599, dated 18th November, 1908, entitled the Foreign Animals (Amendment) Order of 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 335].

Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897—Copy of the Land Transfer Rules, 1908, dated 9th November, 1908 [by Act].

Land Transfer Acts, 1875 and 1897—Copy of the Land Transfer Fee Order, 1908, dated 9th November, 1908 [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Ballyshannon Postal Service.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that on 7th November, the morning letters were not delivered in Ballyshannon until mid-day, and that on 9th November the second delivery of letters was not made till after ten o'clock; and whether, having regard to the frequent complaints of the delay and inconvenience caused by the defects in the postal service in Ballyshannon, he will consider the propriety of directing a public inquiry to be held by a responsible official, with a view to the removal of the causes which so gravely affect the business of the locality and the convenience of its inhabitants.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The delay in the delivery of letters at Ballyshannon on the particular occasions referred to was due to the late arrival of the train at Bundoran Junction. The only way in which the general service to Ballyshannon could be improved would, as explained to the hon. Member some time ago, be by using a train in place of a mail cart from Bundoran Junction to Ballyshannon, but I regret that I am not yet in a position to resume negotiations with the railway company on this matter.

Navies of Great Britain, France, Russia and Germany.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will state the effective fighting tonnage of the navies of Great Britain, France, Russia, and Germany, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. M'Kenna.*)—

	Great Britain.	France.	Russia.	Germany.
	Tonnage.	Tonnage.	Tonnage.	Tonnage.
Vessels under 20 years of age - - - - -	1,749,874	592,699	241,778	561,932
Vessels 20 years of age and over - - - -	103,011	114,874	48,543	66,372
Total tonnage - -	1,852,885	707,573	290,321	628,304

Deserted Wives and Children in Poor Law Establishments.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of deserted wives and the number of their children in the various Poor Law establishments in England and Wales, differentiating between London and the provinces, and in what number of cases efforts have been made by the Poor Law authorities to prosecute the husbands.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Deserted wives and other women relieved apart from their husbands are classified together in the returns received by me, and the returns do not, as regards these classes, fully distinguish between indoor and outdoor relief. On the 1st January last the married women with children in receipt of relief without their husbands in England and Wales numbered 7,298, and they had 20,774 children dependent on them. These numbers include 1,164 women with 3,000 children who were chargeable to unions in London. Between a third and a fourth of the total number of these women is estimated to have been in receipt of indoor relief. The proportion in London estimated is one-half. I have no information as to the number of cases in which proceedings have been instituted by boards of guardians against the husbands of deserted women.

Unmarried Women and Illegitimate Children chargeable to the Poor Law.

MR. CLYNES: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of unmarried women in the various Poor Law establishments in England and Wales, differentiating between England and the provinces, and the number of illegitimate children chargeable to the Poor Law.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Particulars of the total number of unmarried women in receipt of relief in Poor Law establishments in England and Wales are not available. The total number of illegitimate children under sixteen years of age in receipt of relief on 1st January last was 6,735. The mothers relieved with them numbered 4,181, of whom 740 were chargeable to unions in London. The number of these cases in receipt of indoor relief has not been ascertained, but it no doubt comprised nearly all of them.

Irish Tenants to be dealt with under the Purchase Act of 1903.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state approximately the number of tenants in Ireland who still remain to be dealt with under the Purchase Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that the number of tenants who have purchased or agreed to purchase under the various Land Purchase Acts up to 31st October last, inclusive, was 323,853, but they are not in a position to say, even approximately, how many tenants may hereafter apply for advances. I may say, however, that it is believed that more than one-half the total number of tenants in Ireland have already purchased or agreed to purchase, but I am not prepared to hazard an estimate of the number now remaining.

Small Holdings in Notts.

MR. NEWNES (Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the County of Notts 225 applications have been made under the Small Holdings Act, 1907; that of these 65 have been approved; whether any applicants have yet been provided for by the council; and whether any land has yet been acquired.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The reply to the first and second parts of the Question is in the affirmative. No applicants have as yet been provided with land, but the Board have approved the purchase of 99 acres at Willoughby-on-the-Wolds, and the council are in negotiation for various other farms in different parts of the county.

Canadian Exports to Great Britain via the United States.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what quantity of Canadian wheat was sent in bond through the United States to Great Britain during the years 1903–7; what number of Canadian live cattle were sent through the United States to Great Britain under bonding privileges in the same years; what quantity of dead meat was so sent; and if any dairy produce was sent in the same way during these years.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following statement gives the information desired by my hon. friend, so far as the particulars are available.

Statement showing for each of the years from 1903 to 1907, inclusive, the Quantity of certain Canadian Food Products passing through the United States in transit for the United Kingdom—

Calendar year.	Wheat.	Wheat Flour	Live Cattle.	Cheese.	Butter.
	Quarters.	Cwts.	Number.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1903 -	1,721,230	586,084	No Returns available in these years		
1904 -	826,317	396,009			
1905 -	1,190,192	419,956			
1906 -	2,478,519	468,015	39,594	4,044,195	32,100
1907 -	2,334,256	483,201	28,838	20,046,643	Nil

Note.—The above particulars have been taken from the official United States Returns. No particulars are given in these Returns as to the quantity of Canadian dead meat, if any, passing through the United States in transit for the United Kingdom.

Promotion of Superintendents in the Customs Service.

Mr. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that out of a classification of twenty-six superintendents in the Customs Service only eight have been promoted since the beginning of the year 1899; that some of them have been for years marking time at their maximum salary; that through changes which took place in 1899 some are actually receiving a smaller income to-day than they were ten years ago, though performing the same duties; that 69 per cent. of the superintendents entered the service by open competition and have spent an average of about sixteen years in charge of the smaller ports, he will explain why there is withheld from them a reasonable flow of promotion and less generous treatment given than is shown to any other grade in the department who entered the service under similar conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) When the present class of superintendents was created in 1898, the vested interests of the then existing staff had to be duly preserved and all officers who then or afterwards accepted the appointment have done so with full knowledge of the conditions and prospects. As a matter of fact, I understand that none of the superintendents now serving held that position prior to the reorganisation of 1898. As regards promotion the same rule applies to them as to other branches of the Customs Service, viz., that only those who have shown themselves properly qualified for promotion can be promoted, and for such there is a reasonable flow of promotion.

Moonlighting Outrages in West Clare.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the series of moonlighting outrages committed during the last three weeks in the Kilmihill and neighbouring districts of West Clare; whether he is aware that hay has been burned on the holdings of Mr. Marcus Keane, near Labasheeda, and a farmer named Collins, in the Knockena district; that an outhouse has been burned on the farm of Mr. John Crotty, D.C.; that a threatening notice, signed Captain Moonlight, has been posted on the door of a farmer named Benvaran, near Kinlea; that the house of a farmer named Fitzgerald, a district councillor, in Lower Kilmury M'Mahon, was attacked at night and the windows smashed; and that a mare belonging to Mr. Patrick Lillis has had its tail cut to the bone; whether the police have succeeded in discovering the perpetrators of these outrages or any of them; and whether it is intended to allow these proceedings to continue unchecked.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My attention has been called to the cases in question. It is not correct to describe them as a series of moonlighting outrages committed during the last three weeks. Mr. Crotty's outhouse was burned down in September last, and the case cannot be classed as an outrage, as it cannot be determined whether the injury was malicious or not, pending the hearing of his claim for compensation. Mr. Collins does not know whether the burning of his hay was malicious or accidental, and he has not claimed compensation. The police have no knowledge of a threatening notice having been posted on the door of a farmer named Benvaran. I am informed that the breaking of Mr. Fitzgerald's windows was undoubtedly malicious. The mane and the hair of the tail of a mare belonging to Mr. Lillis were cut off, but the flesh was not injured and compensation has not been claimed. All the outrages or supposed outrages referred to in the Question occurred at night, and the police have not been able to ascertain who were the perpetrators or to make any arrests. They are using every effort to prevent misconduct in Clare, and an extra force is on duty in the county with that object.

Applications under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what were the total number of applications and total amount applied for at 31st October under all the provisions of the Irish Land Act, 1903, and the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1907; and what addition, if any, should be made for estimated values, as indicated in the last footnote on page 11 of Paper Cd. 4377.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that up to 31st October applications amounting to £76,288,635 by purchasers, in respect of 228,938 holdings, had been made under all sections of the Act of 1903, including the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907. In addition, 385 estates of an estimated value of £3,807,626, were offered for sale to the Land Commission under Sections 6, 7, and 8, and the Congested Districts Board under Sections 77 and 79, for which negotiations are pending.

Delay in Inspection of the Killasonna Estate.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in the inspection of the Killasonna estate of the late R. Davoren, of Dublin, for the sale of which to the tenants an agreement was entered into four years ago.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that this estate is not being sold direct to the tenants, but has been offered for sale to the Commissioners. It has been inspected, and the inspector's Report is at present under consideration with a view to an offer being made for purchase.

Tuberculosis Bill—Right of Appeal before Removal.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, on the Report stage of the Tuberculosis Prevention Bill, he will agree to insert words which will give individuals or families notified a right of appeal to some properly constituted body before removal from their homes under the provisions of this Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in thinking that power is sought under the

Bill for the compulsory removal from their homes of persons suffering from tuberculosis.

Acquisition of Untenanted Lands at Monydanagha.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any progress has been made by the Estates Commissioners towards acquiring the untenanted lands of Monydanagha, Strokestown, County Longford, which have been offered for sale to them by Mr. James W. Bond, D.L., the owner; and, if not, will they now move in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that an originating application was lodged on 8th November, 1907, by Mr. J. H. Bond for the sale direct to his tenants of his lands at Monydanagha, including 190 acres of untenanted land. The property will be dealt with in its order of priority and with due regard to the prior claims of other estates for the sale of which proceedings were instituted at an earlier date.

The Police and the Clonguish Band.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the night of Thursday, 12th November, about 9 p.m., an attack was made by a number of policemen armed with blackthorn sticks and batons upon the members of the Clonguish band as they were quietly and peaceably returning to their band-room at Newtownforbes; whether this attack was ordered and headed by a sergeant who is not in charge of the district, but is in charge of a police hut at Curry; whether the police were drunk on this occasion, and had been drinking in the public-house of a local magistrate named James McCann; and whether an inquiry on oath will be granted into the whole of the facts attending this attack upon respectable young men.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General of the Royal Irish Constabulary informs me that on the night in question the Clonguish band, who were returning from Longford, stopped opposite a shop in Newtownforbes belonging to Mr. James McCann, who is boycotted, and began to groan and hiss. The sergeant in charge of the Curry protection post, who was present on duty with seven constables, ordered the crowd to move on, and cease groaning and hissing. While he was giving these directions he and one of the constables were struck from behind with sticks. The demeanour of the crowd became most threatening and the sergeant was obliged to order the police to draw their batons and disperse the crowd, which consisted of thirty-five men. A number of these men returned and resumed the groaning and hissing, when they were again dispersed. There is no foundation for the statement that the police had been drinking, and there is nothing in the occurrence calling for an inquiry.

Attack on House of Mr. C. N. Clark at Holycross.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of the attack made by a crowd of persons on the house of Mr. Charles N. Clarke, D.L., at Holycross, County Tipperary, on the night of the 17th instant; what damage was done to the house; were any of the police injured; and have any proceedings been taken against those who organised the attack.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Eight arrests have been made this morning in connection with this case. As proceedings are pending it is not desirable to enter into further particulars.

Criminal Lunatics in Irish Asylums.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the practice of removing persons who become insane while in prison to the lunatic asylum of the district in which the prison is situated, irrespective of the place of origin of the patient, imposes hardship upon the ratepayers of the counties in which such asylums are situated; and whether he will recommend the Treasury to make a grant to the asylum authorities in respect of these criminal lunatics, seeing that in the absence of any law of settlement in Ireland it is impossible to remove these persons to the districts to which they belong.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have nothing to add to the reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member on 19th February last.

Appointments to the Staff of Depots.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a decision has yet been reached as to the appointment of captains of 3rd battalions to the staff of depots; and when applications can be made for such appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Orders have been issued for officers of the Special Reserve of officers, who desire to be temporarily employed at the depot or with the service battalions, to register their names at the Record Office. As opportunity offers these officers will be considered for employment.

Foot and Mouth Disease in Pennsylvania.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what precautions are being taken in the United States of America to prevent the spreading of foot and mouth disease from Pennsylvania to the neighbouring States; whether the Board considers that these precautions render the adjoining States sufficiently secure to justify the continued import of cattle and fodder from them into this country; and what steps have been taken with respect to imported hides and the hides of animals slaughtered at the port of entry.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The most rigid precautions have been taken by the Federal Government, and include absolute prohibition of exportation of cattle of quarantined States, through which animals are only allowed to pass by rail in sealed cars under official supervision. Hides, skins, and hoofs of cattle or sheep, and hay, straw, and fodder, can only be exported from such State after disinfection under official supervision. The Board, as at present advised, see no reason for increasing the restrictions they themselves have imposed either as regards the importation of fodder or of hides generally. The Board's inspectors have ample powers for dealing with hides of animals landed at our ports.

Valuation of Cathcart School Board Land at Holmlea.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the site of 6,886 square yards at Holmlea, Cathcart Bridge, purchased in April by the Cathcart School Board for £3,270 17s., if he will say what was the actual amount by which the annual value for rating of the larger subject of which it formed part has been reduced by reason of the severance therefrom of that purchased site.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) As other portions of the larger subject have been feued besides the portion under discussion the only reply I can give to my hon. friend is that the reduction in the rateable value is calculated at the proportional figure of £2 9s. 10d. per acre, or £3 10s. 10d. for the site referred to.

Irish Postal Supplies.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will arrange that the stationery and supplies generally, including clothing, for the Post Office work and officials in Ireland shall be of Irish material; that a receiving depçt and controller be arranged in Dublin; and that the audit and postal order business shall be transacted in Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Stationery is supplied to the Post Office by the Stationery Office, over which I have no control. Cloth is obtained for the Post Office by the Army Council, who inform me that they cannot arrange to receive and test it in Ireland. I have a responsible officer in charge of the Post Office store depçt in Dublin, and all stores that can, without disadvantage to the public service, be received there are so received. Assuming the hon. Member to mean by "audit" the operations of any officers of the Post Office, the answer is that there is already an accountant's office in Dublin. The decentralisation of postal order business is a matter which will be considered in connection with other proposals for Post Office decentralisation.

Sanitary Condition of Ramsey (Hunts).

MR. BOULTON: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has received the Report of the meeting of the Ramsey Urban District Council convened for the purpose of considering the Report of the county council's consulting medical officer of health on the prevalence of disease and the sanitary condition of Ramsey; if the steps proposed to be taken by the council fall far short of the alterations and improvements suggested by the medical officer of health; and, if so, will he say what steps he proposes to take to deal with matters of grave consequence to the life and health of the town and district.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received a copy of the Resolution passed at the meeting referred to. With regard to infectious disease the district council have determined to adopt the recommendation of the consulting medical officer; and they have decided to adopt some tentative action with regard to water supply and the disposal of refuse and excrement. I cannot regard the Resolution as satisfactory with regard to the disposal of sewage. I am addressing a communication to the district council on this subject, and am requesting to be informed in due course of the further action taken by them with respect to the other matters.

Old-Age Pensions—Deductions for Sick Pay.

MR. RUFUS ISAACS (Reading): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in calculating the means of an applicant under Section 4, subsection 1, of the Old-Age Pensions Act, 1908, account shall be taken of the fact that the applicant has received money in sick pay during the preceding year; and whether account shall be taken of the fact that in the event of illness the applicant would become entitled to receive sick pay.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Under Paragraph (*a*) of Section 4 (1) of the Old-Age Pensions Act, 1908, it is only in the absence of other means for ascertaining the income which the claimant may reasonably expect to receive during the succeeding year that the income actually received during the preceding year has to be taken into account. Unless there was a reasonable expectation of the receipt of sick pay during the succeeding year, the possibility of sick pay should not, I think, be taken into account.

Old-Age Pensions Regulations.

MR. BATEMAN HOPE (Somersetshire, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a woman over seventy years of age who earns any sum less than 8s. a week, and whose husband receives outdoor relief in money for his own support, is eligible for an old-age pension.

MR. BATEMAN HOPE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a person over seventy years of age, who has received outdoor relief in money during the year 1908, is eligible for an old-age pension if the relief has been repaid to the guardians by him or his relatives or friends.

MR. BATEMAN HOPE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a man over seventy years of age, and earning any sum less than 8s. a week, who receives outdoor relief in money for his wife, is eligible for an old-age pension.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I will answer these three Questions together. The reply to the first is in the affirmative, and to the second and third in the negative.

Order against Bastard Children born in the Workhouse.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill to enable a board of guardians to obtain an order against the putative father of a bastard child born in the workhouse, charging him with the cost incurred by the ratepayers for the maintenance of the child and its mother.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I may refer to the Answer I gave on Thursday last to a similar Question put to me by my hon. friend the Member for the Dartford Division. As I then stated, I am aware of the point raised. It is one that will, I have no doubt, be touched upon in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, and, pending their Report, I do not consider that I could properly deal with it.

Vaughan's Charitable School, County Fermanagh.

Mr. FIELD: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to statements reflecting on the management of Vaughan's Charitable School, County Fermanagh; whether any application has been made to him in reference thereto by any responsible body; and whether he will take steps to have an impartial investigation held with the view of testing the truth of the charges made.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) My attention has been called to the statements referred to in the Question by the Secretary of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The school, however, is not under Government control, as the governors of it established a claim to be exempt from the operation of the Educational Endowments Act, 1885, and it is not subject to inspection by the Government. The only persons who appear to have responsibility for the management of the school are the governors, among whom are several gentlemen of position in the county, and, I believe, the bishop of the diocese of the church to which the school belongs. I regret to say that I have no power to order an investigation into the charges made.

Pay of Officers employed writing History of South African War.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can inform the House if any pay of the two captains employed on the Official History of the South African War, since the cost has been removed from the War Office to the Treasury Vote, is charged against Vote 1 of the Army Estimates, or whether the £1,020 taken for the History in the Estimates of the present year is spent on the salaries of these officers and their military pay suspended.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) No pay of the officers employed under the Committee of Imperial Defence in writing the History of the South African War has been charged to Army Votes since the work was transferred from the War Office. As regards the second part of the Question, there are now three officers engaged upon this work and the £1,020 covers the total emoluments of the three.

Amounts issued to meet Capital Expenditure.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the amounts to be issued from the Exchequer to meet capital expenditure during the current financial year 1908–9 to the Admiralty, the War Office, the Civil Services, and the Revenue Departments respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The estimated amounts (given on page 5 of the House of Commons Paper 137 of 1908) are Admiralty £897,000, War Office, £300,000, Civil Services, £338,000, Revenue Departments, £1,250,000.

Light Dues—Expenditure on Lighthouses, etc.

Mr. BOWLES: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state, for each of the financial years 1894–5, 1905–6, 1906–7, and 1907–8, the total amount actually paid in respect of lighthouse dues to the Board of Trade and expended by them through the Trinity Board on lighthouses, buoys, and beacons; and can he say in what part of the accounts of the national expenditure this information can be found.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The following are the figures asked for by the hon. Member:—Light dues collected: 1894–5, £539,037; 1905–6, £500,996; 1906–7, £536,834; 1907–8, £513,422. Expenditure by Trinity House: 1894–5,

£233,561; 1905–6, £239,311; 1906–7, £258,753; 1907–8, £251,328. The information is published for the year 1894–5 in the accounts of the Mercantile Marine Fund, which appear in the appropriation accounts for that year, and in the other years in the accounts of the General Lighthouse Fund, which are presented to Parliament annually.

Petitions of Dockyard Workmen.

MR. OWEN PHILIPPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is now able to give the answers to the petitions from the dockyard workmen; and, if not, when he expects to be able to do so.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) As stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Chatham on Thursday last, it is anticipated that it will be possible to announce the replies to the large number of petitions which have been presented this year by the various classes of dockyard employees some time in February next.

Old-Age Pension Committees.

MR. HICKS-BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the circular issued by the Local Government Board to local authorities dated 4th August, 1908, with reference to the formation of local pension committees, in which no reference is made as to the advisability of securing the assistance of guardians in their private capacity on such committees, notwithstanding that he stated to a deputation of the Poor Law Union Association on 26th June last that it would be difficult for pension committees to do the best by either the Treasury or the deserving poor without obtaining the assistance of prominent and well-known guardians in their districts; and whether he will consult with the President of the Local Government Board as to the advisability of issuing a supplementary circular to local authorities suggesting the desirability of prominent guardians being added to the pension committees.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have not altered my opinion that the assistance of guardians would be of great value to pension committees; but I do not think it would be proper for a Government Department to offer advice to the appointing councils as to the personal qualifications which should be sought for in selecting members of pension committees. I am not prepared, therefore, to suggest to my right hon. friend the issue of a circular in the terms proposed.

Alteration of the Boundaries of the Estate of Penrose, Simla.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he has received a petition from the owner of the estate of Penrose, Simla, which was purchased from the Rana of Koti in 1879, complaining that in the year 1900 the boundary of the estate was altered by Mr. A. Meredith, Deputy-Commissioner of Simla, without the usual notice to the Rana; and, seeing that a portion of the estate of which the present owner was deprived under the new boundary has been given to a Government clerk who owns the adjoining land, will he order an inquiry into the whole facts of the case with a view to the original boundary being restored.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The Memorial referred to has been received by the Secretary of State in Council, who, after full consideration, arrived at the decision that there was no reason to interfere with the Orders already passed.

War Office and Irish Clothing Contracts.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will arrange that the clothing contracts at present under the management and control of the War Office, London, for the supply of official uniforms to the various departments in Ireland shall be placed under an Irish controller with a receiving depot in Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The clothing contracts for the Royal Irish Constabulary are not now under the management or control of the War Department, but are to be made directly by the Inspector-General, and arrangements are also being made for the equipment of a receiving and inspection depot in Dublin for constabulary uniforms. The cloth used by certain other departments in Ireland is tested by the Army Clothing Department, but the question of continuing this arrangement can be considered when existing contracts expire. The contracts are not otherwise controlled by the War Department.

Evicted Tenants—Case of Patrick Mulgrew.

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mr. Patrick Mulgrew, formerly tenant of a farm of twenty-three acres on the estate of the Earl of Ranfurly, in the County of Tyrone, from which he was evicted in 1882; and what progress has been made towards restoring him to his holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received an application from Patrick Mulgrew for reinstatement in his former holding, which has been purchased by the present occupier under the Land Purchase Acts. The application will be considered in the allotment of such untenanted land as the Commissioners may acquire.

Irish National Teachers—Payment of Grant for teaching Mathematics.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when it is proposed to pay the sum due to national school teachers for the teaching of mathematics for the year ending 30th June, 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a similar Question asked by the hon. Member for North Westmeath on the 10th instant.

Report of Poor Law Commission.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the Report of the Poor Law Commission is expected to be laid upon the Table; and if it is his intention to introduce a Bill on the subject next session.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my reply to a Question on the subject asked by the hon. Member for Kilkenny on the 9th instant.

Irish Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received from most of the boards of guardians and other public bodies in Ireland resolutions requesting that Section 3 (1) (*a*) of the Old-age Pensions Act, dealing with poor relief, be repealed; and whether, in view of the hardship this section inflicts upon the very poor, he can see his way to recommend the amendment of this section.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have received resolutions on the subject from a number of public bodies, and I am forwarding them to my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The New Destroyers.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is the difference in price between a 27 and 33-knot destroyer.

The following Questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper:—

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state approximately the financial saving that will be effected by reducing the speed of the sixteen destroyers of this year's programme from the 33 knots promised by the late First Lord of the Admiralty, on 18th March, to the 27 knots now considered sufficient by the present Board of Admiralty.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if the money which will be saved by the building of the sixteen torpedo boats of 27-knot speed instead of 33-knot speed as proposed, will be devoted to the building of further torpedo boats, so as to make up by increased numbers for the decreased speed of the torpedo fleet.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): My predecessor, in his speech of 18th March, was, I believe, referring to the destroyers of the 1907–8 programme which, although ordered in January and February, were not actually laid down till May and June. The design for the destroyers of this year's programme was not considered by the Board till June of this year. A speed of 33 knots was never contemplated. There will be no saving on the cost of this year's destroyers as there has been no reduction in the estimated cost of these vessels. Had the destroyers been designed for a speed of 32 knots and to burn coal, it is calculated that they would have cost an additional £80,000 each.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Lord Tweedmouth's statement in regard to these destroyers mentioned sixteen new destroyers? He could not, therefore, have been referring to last year's programme, which included only five destroyers.

MR. MCKENNA: In speaking of the type of destroyer I believe Lord Tweedmouth to have had in his mind the type of destroyer to be laid down in that year. I cannot understand that he referred to the sixteen new destroyers in the current year's programme, as these destroyers had not been discussed by the Board at all.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Lord Tweedmouth's words were that we were going to lay down sixteen new destroyers, and can he say what reason, if any, there is for reducing the speed from that considered necessary last year to 27 knots, or three knots less than other Powers are adopting?

MR. MCKENNA: It would be most undesirable in the course of Answers to Questions to explain the whole Admiralty policy with regard to destroyers.

Coal v. Oil Fuel for Destroyers.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the sixteen new destroyers building or about to be built for the British Navy have a speed equal to the first-class destroyers building or about to be built for great foreign Powers; whether they can keep up a high speed for as long a time with coal as with oil fuel; whether oil fuel is much more quickly renewed than coal, and does it require much less labour for keeping up speed than coal.

MR. MCKENNA: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. With regard to the remainder of the Question, it is undesirable to state the experience which we have obtained from the use of oil fuel.

MR. HUNT: Are we to understand that the new destroyers built for the British Navy are slower than those built or building for foreign navies, and may I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not the fact that with coal the boilers and tubes get clogged much sooner than with oil, and that, therefore, the vessels cannot go at a high speed for so long?

MR. MCKENNA: The hon. Gentleman has repeated his Question to me, which I have answered fully.

MR. HUNT: I was asking a definite Question.

MR. MCKENNA: Which I have already answered.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Arising out of the first part of the Answer, is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the new destroyers building for the German Government are 30-knot boats?

MR. MCKENNA: Destroyers being built for the German Government during the current year are boats of a much smaller size than the destroyers laid down for the British Government. That involves the whole question of relative size and speed.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): Is the House to understand that the sixteen new destroyers have not the speed of foreign destroyers?

MR. McKENNA: That would seem to follow from the reply.

Forth and Clyde Canal.

SIR GEORGE SCOTT ROBERTSON (Bradford, Central): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty has he received from his professional advisers any official opinion that the enlargement of the Forth and Clyde Canal to a size sufficient to give passage to warships of the "Dreadnought" type, or the digging of a new Forth and Clyde Canal of a similar capacity, is a project of great strategic importance; has the question been recently considered, the line of country surveyed, and the approximate cost estimated; and is he aware that such a national undertaking would at the same time provide work, according to the measure of the necessity, to large numbers of the unemployed for a long time to come.

MR. McKENNA: The question of constructing a ship canal between the Forth and the Clyde has been reported upon from time to time, and it is understood that certain evidence as to the commercial value of such a canal has been given to the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways. As the question cannot be dealt with apart from its commercial importance, it is proposed to await the Report of the Royal Commission before giving the subject fresh consideration.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): Can the right hon. Gentleman say approximately what the cost of this canal would be?

MR. McKENNA: I have heard of various estimates being submitted to the Admiralty ranging from £24,000,000 sterling downwards.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) was understood to ask the cost of a canal without locks.

MR. McKENNA replied that he had not seen any estimate for that, but he assumed that locks would be necessary.

Rosyth.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the expenditure on the new naval base at Rosyth is to be provided for out of revenue, or whether it is intended to raise a loan for the purpose.

MR. McKENNA: The expenditure is to be provided for out of revenue.

British Naval Supremacy.

MR. J. M. MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in recently accepting the definition of the two-Power standard as meaning a preponderance of 10 per cent. over the combined strengths, in capital ships, of the two next strongest Powers, he intended to extend the definition given by himself earlier in the year to the effect that the standard we have to maintain is one which would give us complete command of the sea against any reasonably possible combination of Powers.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The two statements are, in my opinion, under existing conditions identical in meaning and effect.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether we are to understand from his reply that the policy of His Majesty's Government with regard to our naval strength is, and has been for some time, to maintain the standard of power specified in the first part of the Question?

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: May I further ask, in order to dispel certain doubts which have been expressed, but not on this side of the House, whether by the words "the two next strongest Powers" the right hon. Gentleman means the two next strongest Powers whatever they may be, and wherever they may be situated?

MR. ASQUITH: Under existing conditions and under all foreseeable circumstances, I think that is so.

MR. J. M. MACDONALD: May I ask whether, in taking into consideration the two Powers, the right hon. Gentleman has had regard to any reasonably possible combination among those Powers against us?

MR. ASQUITH: The dominating consideration with us is that we should maintain our superiority at sea. As has often been explained by those responsible on both sides of the House, we regard the two-Power standard as a workable formula to give effect to that.

Headquarters Staff.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any steps have been taken to revise the numbers and cost of head-quarters staff, in accordance with the repeated suggestions of the Public Accounts Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I can assure my right hon. friend that I have not overlooked this point; but at the present time I have barely sufficient staff to cope with the extra pressure involved in the organisation of the forces of the Crown, including the Territorial Force.

War Office Historical Department.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what is the present organisation of the Historical or Literary Department at the War Office since the relegation of the official histories of the South African and Russo-Japanese Wars to the Committee of Imperial Defence, with a subhead in Civil Service Estimates; and whether the review of publications of military interest has been the subject of examination by him since the last information was given by him to the House.

*MR. HALDANE: At present there is no Historical or Literary Department at the War Office. As regards the last part of the Question, I understand that the directions I gave with regard to these quarterly reviews have been adhered to.

Special Reserve—Training Pay.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the engagement of men of the Special Reserve to come out for twenty-one days training is not in itself a guarantee according to law that they will receive twenty-one days pay whether they are asked to serve for the whole period or not; and, if so, whether he will give instructions for the men of the 3rd battalion Suffolk Regiment, who received twenty days pay only, to be given the remaining day's pay now owing them, especially as the whole sum involved in this and all other cases is trifling.

MR. HALDANE: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As I informed the hon. Member, I am considering whether in future it will not be possible to arrange that the full twenty-one days training, and consequent pay, shall be given.

MR. PIKE PEASE: Is not the War Office bound to pay for twenty-one days, seeing that the men are engaged for that period?

MR. HALDANE: They are not engaged for twenty-one days.

Brecon Court Martial on Private Wiltshire.

SIR IVOR HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the sentence of fifty-six days imprisonment, with hard labour, recently awarded by a court martial at Brecon on No. 10,290, Private Alfred Wiltshire, South Wales Borderers, for an alleged theft of 1s., which punishment is being carried out in a civil prison; and whether, seeing that Private Wiltshire is a young soldier of good character and with no previous convictions against him, and that the expressed policy of the Government is to withdraw soldiers convicted under the Army Act from contact with criminals in the civil gaols, he will consider the advisability of revising the sentence in question with a view to a reasonable punishment being carried out in a detention barrack.

MR. HALDANE: This man pleaded guilty to two charges of stealing money from his comrades. As this offence is one against the civil law he has been sent to a civil prison from which he will not return to the Army. Detention barracks are intended for the confinement of soldiers convicted of purely military offences who will ultimately return to the ranks.

SIR IVOR HERBERT: Does the right hon. Gentleman adhere to the statement made in this House that offences against the civil power shall be dealt with by the civil instead of by the military authorities?

MR. HALDANE was understood to reply in the affirmative.

Transvaal Civil Service — Members of British Birth.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will say on what page of Command Paper 4353 the information is given of the number of civil servants of British birth in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies who, while being retained in the employment of the Colonial Governments, have had their *status*, rank, and salaries reduced since the grant of self-government to these Colonies, in order that other persons of Boer or Hollander birth, having a less period of service and experience, should be promoted over them; and whether, should this information not be available, he will obtain it from the Governments of those Colonies.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I referred to the Paper in my reply to the hon. Gentleman last Monday as containing all the information on the subject of changes in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony Civil Service which His Majesty's Government are in a position to supply.

MR. CARLILE: Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman get the information asked for which is not in the hands of the Government?

COLONEL SEELY: I could hardly ask Lord Crewe to make the request in the terms of the Question.

MR. CARLILE: But the information asked for is quite as important as that contained in Command Paper 4353.

COLONEL SEELY: The request implies a reflection on the motives of the Government of two self-governing Colonies—an imputation of motives which I very much regret.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask if information which is only partial reflects credit while that which is complete reflects discredit on those who ask for it?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not quite know what the hon. Member means. I say this question implies a motive—[" No, no "]—which ought not to be imputed to the two Governments.

Rhodesian Native Poll Tax.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies is aware that the poll tax of 20s. per head after twelve months' residence in Rhodesia imposed on natives has interfered with the supply of native labour from Blantyre and the Portuguese territory, to the especial detriment of the farming interests in Rhodesia; and whether, having regard to the fact that under the provisions of the Glen Grey Act passed by the Legislature of Cape Colony during the administration of Mr. Rhodes, natives with certificates for six or nine months work are exempt from the poll tax, while in Rhodesia natives with records of years of unbroken service are subject to the poll tax, steps will be taken with a view to the abolition or reduction of this impost in the interests of the country and in aid of the development of its resources.

COLONEL SEELY: The tax of 20s. a head was imposed by an Ordinance of 1904. I am not aware that it has operated in the manner suggested, but I may point out that an arrangement was made recently for getting a party of labourers from Central Angoniland for work on Mashonaland farms. The provisions of the Glen Grey Act to which my hon. friend's Question refers were not found to work satisfactorily and were repealed by an Act of 1905.

Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the attention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies has been directed to the proceedings of a commercial body at Buluwayo, called the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau, whose vice-president, and others of its principal members, are servants of the South African Chartered Company, which has announced that it will supply native boys from 5s. to 30s. per head; whether the Colonial Secretary is aware that complaints have been made that this bureau has interfered in the interests of the South African Chartered Company and of the mines with the native labour market in Rhodesia by the diversion of native labour from work on the farms to the mines, and that the farmers thus find it difficult to obtain native labour; whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies is aware of the charge against this bureau that natives have been prevented from going to work on farms and obliged to work elsewhere; whether there will be an independent investigation into this charge; and whether, in the interest of agriculture in Rhodesia and the liberty of the natives, the Secretary of State for the Colonies will consider the advisability of placing all agencies for the supply of native labour in Rhodesia under the control of a body by whom the wants and interests of the natives and of the community will be considered, which will be directly responsibile to the Colonial Office.

COLONEL SEELY: The Rhodesian native labour bureau is a body constituted under an Ordinance of 1906, which was accepted by the High Commissioner and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for the purpose of collecting and distributing labourers and for facilitating their travelling. I do not find that it is under the control of servants of the company, though two of its members are nominated by the Administrator of Southern Rhodesia. I am aware that complaints have been made that the bureau neglects the interests of the farmers in favour of the mines, but I understand that the natives, who are free to engage in farm work if they wish, are attracted to the mines by the higher rates of pay which they can earn. In its last report for the year ended 30th June, 1908, there is a statement that the bureau ferried 12,000 natives across the Zambesi free last year, of which 4,000 went through the bureau and 8,000 sought work for themselves. The Secretary of State is not prepared to disturb the existing arrangements in the absence of definite evidence that the native is suffering under them, but he will invite the High Commissioner to obtain a Report from the Resident Commissioner in Southern Rhodesia upon any specific statement with which my hon. friend may furnish me.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the agents of this company have intercepted the natives returning to their farms and compelled them to work for the Chartered Company in the mines? Are not statements openly made to that effect?

COLONEL SEELY: If my hon. friend will furnish any information Lord Crewe will inquire into it.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will it be treated as confidential?

COLONEL SEELY: Certainly.

Cairo Drainage Scheme.

MR. J. M. MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has yet received the Report on the Cairo drainage schemes.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox): We have now received a Report from His Majesty's agent at Cairo respecting the proposed drainage of that town. As previous Questions have been asked on this subject, I may state that it appears eleven different schemes for the drainage were prepared before a decision was come to on the subject. As regards opportunities for public discussion, the whole subject has been frequently ventilated in the local Press during the last few years. The actual scheme now accepted has not been submitted to the consideration of any public body, because there does not exist in Egypt any suitable body which could profitably consider proposals of such a highly technical nature. The scheme was drawn up by Mr. Carkeek James, Controller-General of the Cairo drainage works, who had previously successfully carried out the drainage of the city of Bombay. He devoted his entire time to the study of problems connected with the Cairo drainage for more than eighteen months, and his final proposals received the entire approval of Mr. Graham, Director-General of the Department of Public Health, of Sir William Garstin, the then Adviser to the Ministry of Public Works, and finally of the Council of Ministers. We are informed that a portion of the approved scheme of drainage is on the Shone system. This system of raising sewage by compressed air has, in the last twenty-eight years, been used in 300 towns all over the world, and the sewage of the Houses of Parliament is so lifted. There is now no patent in connection with this system. As regards the construction of the various sections into which the work is divided, it is intended to ask for tenders, open to all, by notice in the *Official Journal* in the usual manner.

French Rentes and English Consols.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state the number of holders of French Rentes and of English Consols; and the average holding in each case.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The number of accounts open in French Rentes at the close of 1907 was 4,631,857, the average amount of an account being 4,790 francs. The number of accounts open in Consols in the books of the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland at the end of March last was 144,398, the average amount of an account being £3,684. There were also 110,714 Stock Certificates outstanding, which represented £47,694,000 Consols, the average amount represented by each certificate being £430.

MR. WEDGWOOD was understood to ask if in view of the fact that stock certificates seemed to be more popular with small holders the right hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of facilitating their issue?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will consider that.

Unemployment Grant.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, with a view to securing the promised elasticity in the administration of the additional £100,000 proposed to be voted to the central fund for the relief of distress due to unemployment, the extra supplementary estimate in connection therewith will be so framed as to permit grants being made through approved channels other than distress committees.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: As I informed the hon. Member on the 11th instant, the additional £100,000 will be voted as a supplement to the grant of £200,000, which has already been voted specifically in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, and can therefore, under the existing law, only be appropriated to the same purposes as the former grant. The Government, however, have the matter under consideration, as they are anxious to provide for all possible elasticity in the administration of these grants.

Bank of England Notes.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the Bank of England wrote off, on 28th October, a sum of £14,055, on account of bank notes issued by the Bank of

England but not presented for repayment; whether this is the total value of bank notes not presented in the period dealt with; how many years this figure covers; whether he can state the annual value of deposit accounts and unclaimed balances which revert to the Bank of England; whether these sums are appropriated by the Bank of England, and, if so, on what grounds; and whether he proposes to cause inquiry to be made into the extent to which these practices prevail in the Bank of England and joint stock banks.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The sum of £14,055 was written off on the 10th instant from the total of notes issued from the Issue Department of the Bank of England, in accordance with Section 6 of the Bank Act, 1892. That sum represents the value of the notes which, on 28th October, had been issued for more than forty years, and had not been presented for payment or previously written off. With regard to the remainder of the Question, I do not think that I can usefully add anything to the replies which I have already given to the hon. Member on the subject of unclaimed bank balances.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Are we to understand that this sum covers a period of forty years?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, that is so.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Well, that is wrong. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these sums are being periodically written off by the Bank of England, and does he mean to suggest that it is forty years since the Bank of England last wrote any off?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: If my hon. friend will wait until he has the Answer in writing he will see that is not the Answer I made.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I have got it in writing here.

Old-Age Pensions—Residence Abroad.

MR. R. HARCOURT (Montrose Burghs): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a claimant, otherwise duly qualified, must under the Old-Age Pensions Act be refused a pension on the sole ground of residence abroad during fourteen of the last twenty years; and whether a pension officer is bound to refuse such a claim under recent regulations on the ground that eight years absence must be the limit, or whether some discretion can be allowed in this respect.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The matter is governed by Section 2 (2) of the Act and Article 29 of the Regulations, to which I may perhaps refer my hon. friend. He will see from that Regulation that the exceptions are much wider than his Question suggests. The section of the Act to which I have referred requires the term "residence" to be defined by regulations. It would not, therefore, be possible to leave it to the discretion of the pension authorities.

Pay of Clerks of Pension Committees.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the remuneration awarded under the Treasury regulations for the payment of clerks of local pension committees and sub-committees has proved inadequate in view of the work involved in the first year of their tenure of office; whether county councils have any statutory right to levy a rate to supplement such remuneration; and, if not, whether the Government are taking any steps to meet the difficulty.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, Sir. I am not aware that the Treasury scale of remuneration to clerks of pension committees and sub-committees has proved inadequate, and, as the amount payable under that scale depends in the main on the volume of the work dealt with, I think the scale will be sufficiently elastic to meet the necessities of the period of exceptional pressure consequent upon the introduction of the scheme. The present arrangements are, however, necessarily experimental in character, and they will be subject to revision when the accounts for the first quarter have been received and considered.

Mr. LANE-FOX: Can the local authority legally increase the rate of remuneration out of the rates?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should like notice of that Question.

Fiscal Policy of International Trade—Mr. Alfred Marshall's Pamphlet.

Mr. GIBB (Middlesex, Harrow): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether with a view to the better understanding of the recently issued Memorandum by Mr. Alfred Marshall on the fiscal policy of international trade, he will lay upon the Table of the House the terms of the request made to Mr. Marshall in 1903 that he should give his views on the subject.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, Sir. I do not think it would be desirable for me to lay these Papers upon the Table of the House.

Mr. FELL: Was it the Memorandum written up to date which was quoted by the right hon. Gentleman in his Budget speech, or was it the old Memorandum of 1903?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I quoted from the Memorandum of 1903. There was practically no alteration.

Commitments of Rate Defaulters.

Mr. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will communicate with the Prison Commissioners with a view to framing and allowing prison rules by which the Governors of His Majesty's Prisons at Brixton and Holloway may be directed to transmit to the councils of the Metropolitan boroughs, on the usual quarter-days, returns containing the names of the prisoners committed for non-payment of the general rate, with the sums mentioned in the warrants of commitment and the amounts remitted to the borough treasurers of the respective boroughs during the preceding quarter; and whether he will confer with the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain as to the desirability of adopting a similar procedure for Police Courts in the Metropolis, as provided for under Sections 2 and 9 of The Prison Act, 1898, and Section 29 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I am unwilling at the present time to throw on the staff of the prisons or Police Courts more additional clerical labour than is actually necessary, but I will give my best consideration to any suggestions that the borough councils may make to me on the subject to which the hon. Member refers.

Florists' Assistants.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many prosecutions during 1906, 1907, and up to date in 1908 have been instituted against florists for working women and young persons under the conditions which would be legalised by the Home Office Orders 806, 807, and 808.

Mr. GLADSTONE: No proceedings have been taken during this period for employment of women and young persons in the manner permitted by the Orders mentioned. I must point out that until last year the application of the Factory Act to florists was a doubtful point, and that since the decision was given in the case of *Hoare* v. *Green* last year, the representations from the trade, on which these orders were made, have been under my consideration. I should perhaps also add that the effect of the decision is not to bring the whole of the trade within the scope of the Act, but only those cases in which it can be shown that manual labour in the manufacture of wreaths, etc., is exercised to a substantial extent.

Approaches to the House.

Mr. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will arrange for the same police facilities to be afforded to Members crossing to the Houses of Parliament from the Embankment as is now afforded to those crossing from Parliament street.

Mr. GLADSTONE: To regulate vehicular traffic by the entrance to the House from the Embankment on the same lines as at the Parliament Street crossing (which the Commissioner of Police informs me is used by about four-fifths of the Members entering and leaving the House) would necessitate the employment of three additional constables. As there are subways provided for Members wishing to enter and leave by the Embankment, the same police assistance is not required there, and I do not think the extra expense would be justified.

Petrol Accidents.

MR. P. BARLOW (Bedford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the frequency of accidents involving loss of life and personal injuries arising from the ignition or explosion of petrol and other vapours; and whether he is prepared to take any, and, if so, what, steps to ascertain whether any means exist of preventing such accidents.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have had this matter under my consideration, and I hope shortly to be able to appoint a small Committee to consider the question of the use of mechanical devices to diminish the dangers attendant on the storage of petrol spirit.

MR. P. BARLOW: And will the Committee be asked to consider the necessity of any alteration of the law affecting these matters?

MR. GLADSTONE was understood to reply in the affirmative.

American Wages and Food Prices.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a Memorandum published by the Washington Department of Commerce and Labour on American wages and the retail price of food; and if he can obtain a copy of this Memorandum for use in the Library.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): I presume that the hon. Member has in mind two articles which appeared in the *Bulletin* of the United States Bureau of Labour for July last, of which one relates to "Wages and Hours of Labour, 1890–1907," and the other to "Retail Prices of Food, 1890–1907." I will have a copy of the publication placed in the Library as the hon. Member desires.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) Cannot a synopsis of the Report be published in the *Labour Gazette*?

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): It has already been done.

Berlin Copyright Conference.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Berlin Conference on Copyright has finished, and whether its recommendations have been signed by the representatives of all the countries present; whether a statement of the alterations proposed will be laid upon the Table of the House before any action has been taken by the Government to ratify them, such statement showing what alterations can be made by Orders in Council and what requires legislation; and whether, before the Government takes any action, those interested in the question will have an opportunity of laying their views before it.

MR. CHURCHILL: A revised text of the Berne Convention was signed by all the parties to the Conference on the 13th instant. The Report of the British delegates has been received and will, as I have previously stated, be published in due course. Full opportunity will be given to those interested to submit their views before any action is taken by His Majesty's Government. Any alteration in the existing law of copyright must of necessity be made by legislation. An Order in Council, as stated in a reply given to the hon. Member for North Salford on Monday last, can only give foreign works the benefit of the existing law, and cannot alter that law.

Old-Age Pensions and Poor Relief.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether an applicant for an old-age pension will be held to be disqualified owing to the receipt of poor relief which has been wholly repaid to the guardians on his behalf.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am advised that the Answer to the Question is in the affirmative.

Contributions to Parents' Maintenance.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a man, aged eighty-five years, who is without any means, but is living with and supported by his son, is rightly refused by the local pensions committee an old-age pension under the new Act, on the ground that the equivalent of the board and lodging given by the son, which he is under no obligation to furnish, exceeds in amount the sum of twelve shillings a week.

MR. JOHN BURNS: If the value of the board and lodging given to the old man can be fairly taken as exceeding £31 10s. per annum the local pension committee would seem to be right in refusing him a pension.

MR. CARLILE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a working man supporting his father would be only receiving ordinary wages?

*MR. JOHN BURNS: All these facts have been laid before the Law Officers.

MR. CARLILE: Are we to understand it is proposed to put a premium on turning old people out of their homes to be supported by charity?

[No Answer was returned.]

Bastardy Laws.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will consider the advisability of so amending the existing Bastardy Laws that boards of guardians should have power, on paternity being proved, to obtain an order against the putative father of any bastard child born in the workhouse, charging such putative father with the cost incurred by the ratepayers for the maintenance both of the child and of the mother during the whole period of her being in the workhouse, such cost being limited to 5s. a week as in the case of ordinary bastardy orders.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I may refer to the Answer I gave on Thursday last to a similar Question put to me by my hon. friend the Member for the Dartford division. As I then stated, I am aware of the point raised. It is one that will, I have no doubt, be touched upon in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, and pending their Report I do not consider that I could properly deal with it.

Poplar Unemployed.

MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has been asked to sanction any schemes of work for the unemployed of the Metropolitan Borough of Poplar, suggested to the Central (Unemployed) Body by the Poplar Borough Council and, if not, whether he can state what are the reasons which have prevented the Central (Unemployed) Body from forwarding any such schemes for his consideration.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I understand that three schemes were submitted by the Poplar Borough Council to the Central Unemployed Body. Two were for works of street paving and repair, and the third was for the widening of East India Dock Road, which it was proposed should be undertaken by the London County Council. The two former schemes, subject to a comparatively slight modification, have been submitted to me by the Central Body and are under consideration. With reference to the third, the Central Body informed the Borough Council that they were of opinion that they should receive any application for a contribution in respect of it from the London County Council, who were evidently the responsible authority.

Westminster Improvement Scheme.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): I beg to ask the President of the Local

Government Board if his attention has been drawn to the fact that operations under the Westminster Improvement Scheme are practically at a standstill; whether the immediate prosecution of this scheme would provide work for large numbers of unemployed in London; will he say what authority is responsible for the delay; and will he make representations to the authority in question with a view of the work being proceeded with at once.

MR. JOHN BURNS: There are two schemes to be carried out in relation to this matter, one by the London County Council and the other by the St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Company. As regards the former, I am informed that the County Council have acquired practically all the property needed for the improvement, and that some of the works have been carried out. The County Council are, however, precluded from using the property of the London Hydraulic Power Company, until a new pumping station and works have been constructed, and the Westminster Supply Corporation are entitled to retain possession of their premises in Millbank for two and-a-half years from 1st November 1907. Both companies are erecting new works, but the Council are advised that until these sites have been obtained it would be impracticable to proceed with the improvement at Millbank. As regards the Scheme of the Improvement Company the Act authorising it was obtained in 1906, and the company are allowed five years for the compulsory purchase of the lands required. I understand that the company have acquired about one-fifth of the area, and that, as opportunity offers, they are acquiring further blocks of premises, but that at present practically no demolition has been carried out. When the Act of 1906 was obtained, it was hoped that when the area was cleared and new and wider streets were contsructed, the property would rapidly be purchased for a superior class of buildings, but hitherto this has not proved to be the case. It rests with the company to carry out the scheme which would of course provide work. They are no doubt aware of the desire that they should expedite the execution of the scheme, but they cannot be compelled to do so.

Labour Tests.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the unions in which the modified labour test has been sanctioned by his Department; and what are the conditions which must be complied with and the evidence which must be produced by a board of guardians before this method of dealing with distress due to want of employment can be adopted.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The order to which my hon. friend refers is, no doubt, that which is known as the modified workhouse test order, and which prescribes regulations where relief is given out of the workhouse to the wife and family of any able-bodied male person who is relieved in the workhouse. There is a permanent order in force at Poplar. The ordinary orders are only issued for a limited period in particular cases. Such an order is in force at present in the Poor Law unions of Fulham, Kensington, Wandsworth and West Ham, and is about to be issued to Woolwich. No special conditions have been prescribed which must be complied with before the order is issued. Application must be made by the guardians who desire to have the order, and the application should be accompanied by a statement of the grounds on which it is made.

MR. ALDEN: Has any application been received up to the present?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I cannot say.

Modified Workhouse Test Order.

MR. BROOKE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state what are the unions in which he has altered the conditions of the modified labour test, as sanctioned by him in January of this year; and in what respects those alterations change the original conditions.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The ordinary modified workhouse test order is only issued temporarily. I have not altered the conditions referred to in it as regards any union in which it is in force. In the case of Poplar, where the temporary order expired at the end of June last, I have issued a permanent order laying down the conditions under which relief may be given out of the workhouse to the family of an able-bodied man relieved in the workhouse. By these conditions the period during which relief out of the workhouse may be given to the family in such cases is limited to eight weeks in any year ending at Lady-Day, and some restrictions are placed on the period during which the man may be temporarily absent from the workhouse. If the prescribed conditons are violated, relief to the man and his family during a period of twelve months can, subject to certain exceptions, only be given in the workhouse.

British Newspapers for the United States and Canada.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the complaints coming from the United States and Canada that British newspapers are not sent by German fast steamers, though letters are so sent, and that there is an unreasonable delay in the receipt of British newspapers owing to this service not being used for the transmission of newspapers, whether it is intended to take advantage of this service in the future.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): My hon. friend is under a misapprehension in supposing that different treatment is accorded to letters and newspapers addressed to the United States of America. With the exception of parcels all articles of correspondence marked by the senders for transmission by German steamer are so sent.

Single Area School Children.

MR. WALTER ROCH (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will give the number scholars on the register of the 307 single area voluntary schools in Wales.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): 23,692.

The New Law Courts.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will state what circumstances have arisen which render necessary the immediate erection, at an estimated total cost of £95,000, of additional law Courts on the open space at the western side of the existing Law Courts, and the consequent destruction of the open space in question.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The necessity arises owing to the inadequate accommodation afforded by the existing Courts.

MR. BOWLES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that recently week after week existing Courts have been constantly vacant, and that there is nothing which can be described as pressure on the accommodation?

MR. L. HARCOURT: I know that occasionally Courts are vacant; but I am obliged to take the information which is given me by His Majesty's Judges.

Estate Duty Office Clerks.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the Second Division clerks in the Estate Duty Office, London, elected at the beginning of this year to accept a reduction of maximum salary from £350 to £300, in return for an immediate increase of about £50 per annum; whether, in view of this expression of preference for immediate benefit, he will withdraw that condition of promotion to the First Division (Class 2) which requires those clerks to whom promotion is offered to reverse their decision and accept a corresponding present reduction, in consideration of the restoration of the £350 maximum, with a remote possibility of promotion to Class 1 in a few cases; and, in the event of his being unable to do this, whether, as the future scale of salary for these clerks will then be on the whole no better than their present scale, as Second Division clerks, he will state what steps he proposes to take to secure to the promoted clerks an adequate recompense for undertaking superior duties.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): I have nothing to add to the replies which I have already given on this subject.

Mr. NIELD: But this is quite a different Question.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot admit that. I have examined it very carefully.

Second Division Clerks.

Mr. NIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the number of Second Division clerks in the Civil Service throughout the United Kingdom promoted to the First Division on or since 1st April, 1908; how many of them sustained loss of salary on such promotion, and in what offices these were located; how many of them sustained no such loss, and in what offices these were located; and the like particulars of promotions between 1st April, 1907 and 1st April, 1908.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I have not the information asked for, and the trouble involved in the preparation of such a statement would appear to be out of proportion to the results obtained.

Mr. NIELD: Will the hon. Gentleman attempt to get any portion of the information?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot.

Retirement Allowances.

Mr. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can acquaint the House with the exact terms of the Departmental Rule by which the Treasury now interprets the financial limits of its statutory power under Section 7 of the Superannuation Act, 1859, to award to any person retiring or removed from the public service in consequence of the abolition of his office such special annual allowance by way of compensation as on a full consideration of the circumstances of the case may seem to the Treasury Commissioners to be a reasonable and just compensation for the loss of office; whether he can say at what date this rule was first adopted; whether it is applied in the case of Civil servants who entered the service before that date; whether it has any and, if so, what Parliamentary sanction or authority; and whether, and if so, when and in what form, it has been communicated either to the Civil Service or to this House.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: There are no financial limits on the statutory power of the Treasury under Section 7 of the Superannuation Act, 1859, except the limits imposed by the provisions of that section. In ordinary cases the amount of the special annual allowance by way of compensation for abolition of office does not exceed the amount of superannuation allowance to which the retiring officer would be entitled if his retirement were due to ill-health. This rule is the outcome of a gradual growth of precedents, and it was stated to the House of Commons by Mr. Goschen as long ago as 22nd August, 1889. That statement was made in view of a Resolution by the House of Commons carried against the Government of the day on 12th June, 1888, condemning the grant of such allowances altogether. In considering awards under the section in question, the Treasury has felt bound to have regard to the wishes of the House of Commons as expressed in that Resolution and to the pledge given on behalf of the Executive by Mr. Goschen. The actual amount of the award, however, in each case is settled by the Treasury in virtue of the discretion given them by the section itself after due consideration of the merits of the case. There is no difference of practice as between officers who entered the service prior to, and those who entered the service since, any particular date.

Mr. BOWLES: Was not the pledge given by the Goschen Committee strictly limited to six months, and was there not a promise of legislation at the end of that time?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Not so far as I am aware.

Improvement of Horse Breeding.

Mr. WALTER ROCH (Pembroke): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can give the amount of money expended from the Imperial funds on the improvement of the breed of horses and cattle in England and Wales, respectively.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The information asked for by the hon. Member is not available. An annual contribution of £5,100 is voted under Class VII., Vote 2, to the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, and the Commission informs me that out of this sum they offer twenty-eight premiums of £150 each for thoroughbred stallions in England, Wales and Scotland, but I have no means of ascertaining the amount that is actually spent in this way in England and Wales respectively. I am not aware of any expenditure of public money upon improving the breed of cattle.

Civil Service Examinations.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the expense, disappointment, and inconvenience to which intending candidates for Civil Service examinations are put by the action of the Civil Service Commissioners in suspending, without adequate notice, such examinations during the revision of regulations; and whether he will take steps to ensure in future that no such suspension of an examination shall take place until after adequate notice has been given to its prospective candidates.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The Civil Service Commissioners can hold examinations only for the purpose of filling existing vacancies in the Civil Service or vacancies estimated to arise within the ensuing six months, and their function is to frame such schemes, and to hold such examinations as meet the requirements of the Departments concerned. When administrative changes in the public service, not initiated by the Commissioners, have the effect of reducing the staff employed in any class, and thus of suspending for a time the occurrence of vacancies in that class, it is often impossible for the Civil Service Commissioners to give long notice to intending candidates, but notice is always given on these occasions at the earliest possible date.

Customs—Statistical Department Abstractors.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is prepared to take steps whereby the senior abstractors of the Statistical Department of His Majesty's Customs may be able to count the whole of their unestablished service in qualifying for pensions; what is the nature of the replies given by his predecessors; and when were those replies given.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The answer is in the negative. The previous replies to which I referred the hon. Member in my former Answer were as follows:—

Member.	Date.	*Hansard.*
To the hon. Member for South West Ham -	16th May 1907	Vol. CLXXIV p. 1100
To the hon. Member for Blackburn - -	17th May 1906	Vol. CLVII p. 654
To the hon. Member for Woolwich - -	26th March 1906	Vol. CLIV p. 840

I will forward to the hon. Member a copy of the last reply which most fully explains the action of the Treasury.

Expenditure on Small Holdings.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can state how much of the £100,000 voted by Parliament for facilitating the working of the Small Holdings Act has been expended up to date.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): None of it has as yet been actually spent, but heavy calls are likely to be made on it shortly.

Small Holdings in Kent.

MR. ROWLANDS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the attention of the Board has been drawn to the statement of Earl Darnley, as chairman of the Small Holdings Committee of the Kent County Council, that if land cannot be obtained by agreement more expeditiously in the future than at present the compulsory powers will have to be put in force; and whether, under the circumstances, the Board will fix an early date after which they will advise county councils to apply for compulsory powers.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are aware of the statement to which my hon. friend refers. The Commissioner advised the county council more than three months ago to take action with regard to the compulsory acquisition of land at the earliest date possible in those cases where there was no reasonable prospect of suitable land being obtained by argeement. Sub-committees are now meeting in every district to consider what land shall be acquired compulsorily, and under these circumstances my hon. friend will no doubt agree that it would not be desirable at present to fix any particular date for application by the county council for compulsory powers.

Diseased Pennsylvanian Cattle.

MR. STANIER (Shropshire, Newport): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if there are any animals now on their way from Pennsylvania to Great Britain; and, if so, will they be watched or destroyed.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Four vessels from Philadelphia and three from New York are known to have left America with cattle for this country. The landing of cattle from vessels arriving from Philadelphia and New York will be made subject to special orders which give ample powers to the Board to deal with the vessels themselves and their cargoes.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will consider the desirability of scheduling the whole of the United States against the importation of live stock and also straw into Great Britain on account of the outbreak in Pennsylvania.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Owing to the spread of disease to the State of New York, the States of New York and New Jersey have been added to the Schedule of prohibited countries, but there seems no present necessity on the information available to extend the restrictions. The position is, however, being very carefully watched, and the Board will not hesitate to take further action if necessity arises.

MR. STANIER: Can the hon. Gentleman give us any further details as to the spread of this disease, and are precautions being taken?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I do not think I can add very much to what I have said, except to assure the hon. Gentleman that the Board are taking and will take every possible precaution. That, I think, is shown by the fact that they did not lose a moment on the outbreak occurring in New York in scheduling New York.

Black Scab in Potatoes.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, after reading the Order, dated 1st October, 1908, on Black Scab in Potatoes (Ireland) Order, 1908, he will adopt the preventive measures there defined.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The disease is apparently much more prevalent in Great Britain than in Ireland, and it would not at present be practicable to adopt the measures to which the hon. Member refers.

English and Irish Agricultural Orders.

MR. STANIER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if the British and Irish

Boards of Agriculture do consult and exchange orders together; and, if not, will he arrange to do this so that the same procedure may be adopted in the two islands when the same disease is being taken in hand.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The conditions obtaining in certain diseases are not always identical in the two countries, and though action on similar lines is recognised as desirable it is not found practicable on all occasions to carry it into effect.

Food and Drug Adulteration in Scotland.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the numbers of samples taken under the Food and Drugs Act, or the corresponding Scottish Act, for the years 1905–6–7; how many prosecutions were instituted and with what result; and what is the average annual cost of working this Department.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The number of formal samples examined by analysts on behalf of local authorities to Scotland for the years ended 30th September, 1905, 1906, and 1907, and the number of prosecutions and the result of such prosecutions were as follows—

	1905.	1906.	1907.
Number of samples	7,221	7,614	6,842
Number of prosecutions - - -	373	419	369
Number of convictions - - -	300	328	282

No information is collected by the Local Government Board for Scotland regarding the annual cost of working the Food and Drugs Acts.

Cahirciveen Evicted Tenant.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the farm near Cahirciveen from which William Bourke was evicted more than twenty years ago is in the hands of the landlords, the provost and fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, and that this farm has for a number of years past been let as a grazing farm on the eleven-months system; and whether steps will now be taken to have the eldest son of the late William Bourke put into possession of this farm.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they cannot see their way to take any action in reference to the application of John J. Bourke for reinstatement in the farm at one time held by his father. The Commissioners understand that the farm in question is now held by another tenant.

Riverstown Cattle Drive Fatality.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what efforts, if any, are being made by the Irish Government to bring to justice the person who murdered John Stenson on Mr. Phibbs's ranch at Riverstown, County Sligo, on 29th October last.

MR. CHERRY: I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to the Questions asked by the hon. Members for North Sligo and Mid Armagh on the 5th instant.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Is the Government not in possession of the name of the man who fired the fatal shot?

MR. CHERRY: No, Sir.

MR. BELLOC: Can the right hon. Gentleman not get possession of the name?

MR. CHERRY: No, Sir.

MR. BELLOC: Why not?

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): Is it advisable, Mr. Speaker, to make use of the expression "murdered" in reference to a person who was killed by a policeman in the course of his duty?

*MR. SPEAKER: If an hon. Member puts that interpretation upon an unfortunate occurrence it is not for me to find fault with it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: In that case, is any Member of the House entitled to put his own construction upon the action of any person, whether he be a policeman or otherwise?

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes, he can put his own construction. It is not always desirable that he should mention it to the House.

Kenmare Sub Land Commission.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the earliest date on which the Land Commission will issue the orders of the Court fixing fair rents in the eight applications heard at the sitting of the Sub-Land Commission at Kenmare on 21st July last relating to holdings in the parishes of Kenmare and Bonane, on the estate of Lord Lansdowne, having regard to the fact that Lord Lansdowne has sold the holdings in both these parishes and has expressed his intention to sell to those eight tenants on the same terms in the event of the fair-rent orders being issued before the end of November; and whether, under the circumstances, he will direct that the orders be issued on or before 25th November instant.

MR. CHERRY: The Land Commission inform me that it is expected that judgment will be delivered in these cases during the present month.

Intermediate Education Grants for Girls.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many girls' schools received grants in the present year from the funds administered by the Commissioners of Intermediate Education, and how many girls presented themselves at the various examinations of the Intermediate Board.

MR. CHERRY: The Commissioners of Intermediate Education inform me that no school grants have as yet been paid in respect of the examinations in the present year. The number of girls who presented themselves in 1908 for examination in the preparatory grade was 921; in the junior grade, 1,837; in the middle grade, 678; and in the senior grade, 211; making a total of 3,647.

Land Purchase in County Cork.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the average number of years purchase, including the bonus, paid in the county of Cork for land sold under the Act of 1903; and also the average number of years purchase paid for land sold in the county of Cork under the Ashbourne Act.

MR. CHERRY: The Land Commission inform me that the average number of years purchase agreed upon by tenant purchasers in County Cork under the Act of 1903 was 23·8 including the bonus. The average number of years purchase for land in the same county sold under the Act of 1885 was 15·1.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): Is it not the fact that most of the purchasers under the Ashbourne Act were first term tenants, and that the annuity payable was £4 as compared with £3 5s. under the existing Act? Is it also the case that out of 2,000 purchasers in Cork who purchased under the Ashbourne Act at twenty years 1,700 purchased in five years under the existing Act at a rate of 30 per cent. reduction as compared with 28 per cent. reduction under the Ashbourne Act?

MR. CHERRY: I believe the hon. Member is quite right in saying the main purchasers under the Ashbourne Act were first term tenants. I cannot say as to the figures quoted, but if they are those contained in a letter received by my right hon. friend this morning they are, I am instructed, substantially correct. The annuity under the Ashbourne Act was 4 per cent. as compared with 3¼ under the present Act.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is it not the fact that those who bought under the Ashbourne Act after payment for ten years of an annuity at the rate of 4 per cent. for the second ten years only paid £3 11s. 10d., and for the third term only £3 4s 6d.; while for the remainder of the term they only paid £2 17s. 11d., whereas under the Act passed in this House in 1896 by Mr. Gerald Balfour —although the purchaser began at a rate of 4 per cent.——

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is much too lengthy a Question; notice should be given.

Mr. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): With regard to the figures concerning the number of years purchase in County Cork, are they based on the actual or on the nominal rent? Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the vendor has to give a return of the actual rent paid for the last five years prior to the sale, and I would like to know what is the difference between the actual and the nominal rent?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Questions like this should really be put on the Paper.

School Inspectors in Ireland.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have appointed or propose to appoint, a number of women inspectors of schools.

Mr. CHERRY: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they have issued an advertisement for a junior inspector of National schools, and that they are prepared to consider the applications of both men and women for the position.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): Will the Chief Secretary see that professional teachers are appointed?

Mr. CHERRY: My right hon. friend has no control over the Commissioners. They are a separate body and must act on their own discretion.

Mr. J. MURPHY: But they will generally take a hint from the right hon. Gentleman.

Land Purchase in Galway.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of purchasers under the Ashbourne Act in the county of Galway and what was the average percentage of reductions; what is the number of purchasers in that county under the Purchase Act of 1903 and at what number of years purchase, including the bonus, the purchases have taken place; and how these figures compare with sales in the County of Cork.

Mr. CHERRY: The Land Commission inform me that the number of purchasers in Galway under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885, was 951, and the average number of years purchase was 16·5. The number of purchasers in the same county under the Act of 1903 was 3,716, and the number of years purchase including the bonus was 24·1, or, excluding it, 21·5. There were 1,361 purchasers in County Cork under the Act of 1885, and 17,473 under the Act of 1903, the average number of years purchase under the former Act being 15·1, and under the latter Act 21·3 excluding the bonus, and 23·8 including it.

Ex-Service Men in Irish Asylums.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can say why the deductions made from the pensions of naval and military inmates of Irish district asylums, on account of the rate-in-aid, are retained by the Paymaster General, and consequently accrue to the benefit of the Exchequer.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can say why the deductions made from the pensions of naval and military inmates of Irish districts asylums, on account of rate-in-aid, are retained by the Paymaster General, and consequently accrue to the benefit of the Exchequer.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: The deductions in question accrue to the benefit of the Exchequer in virtue of the provisions of Section 7 (2) of the Superannuation Act of 1887.

Captain DONELAN: Why are not these deductions applied to Irish purposes seeing that the Irish taxpayers contribute to the pensions.

Mr. HOBHOUSE was understood to reply that they went into the general Exchequer.

Longford Telephone Service.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any further progress has been made by his Department in the matter of extending the trunk telephone service from Dublin or Sligo to Longford, and similar towns, on the Midland and Great Western Railway system.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am in correspondence with the local authorities and others on the subject of an extension of the trunk telephone system to Sligo, Mullingar and other places on the Midland and Great Western Railway system on guarantee terms. If an extension to Mullingar is found practicable, the question of a further extension to Longford can then be considered.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Did not Mr. Hanbury promise this extension seven or eight years ago?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I believe he promised it on certain reasonable conditions.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: When may we expect a definite answer?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I cannot say anything further at present.

Riverstown (Sligo) Postmistress's Husband.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware of the character of the so-called Protestant Mutual Defence Association formed at Riverstown, County Sligo, for the purpose of intimidating Protestants and compelling them to transfer their custom from the Catholic to the Protestant traders and mechanics of that village and generally of creating in the district that ill-will which has recently eventuated in murder; whether it is with his sanction that one of the Protestant traders, the local postmaster, has assisted in founding this boycotting trade society with the sectarian name and actively practises its policy; and if not, what action he proposes to take to restore the non-partisan character of the postal service in the Riverstown district.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have made inquiries in this matter, and find no reason to suppose that the postal service in the Riverstown district is of a partisan character, or that the actions of the husband of the sub-postmistress of Riverstown (to whom the hon. Member is presumably referring) are such as to call for official notice.

Civil Service Superannuation.

Mr. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government is now in a position to submit to Parliament legislation framed to carry into effect the principles recommended by the Courtney Commission for amending the law as to superannuation in the Civil Service.

Mr. ASQUITH: The Government has already expressed the hope that the Bill may be introduced next session.

Town Planning Committee.

Mr. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that he recently promised to do his best to remedy the inconvenience caused to Grand Committees by the absence of any Law Officer of the Crown from their discussions, and in view of the delay in the Grand Committee dealing with the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill, due to the absence of any legal authority competent to decide upon questions of definition and interpretation, he will now say what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am informed that it is not correct to say that any substantial inconvenience or delay has been caused in the Grand Committee referred to by the absence of a Law Officer; clerks and other officers competent to advise on points which may arise are always in attendance. It is impossible for a Law Officer to attend the Committee Stages of all Bills which are referred to Grand Committees, and it has never been regarded as their duty to do so. Whenever from the particular subject matter, either of the Bill as a whole, or of some of its clauses, serious legal difficulties are likely to arise, the Law Officers do their best to be present and give their assistance.

Mr. LANE-FOX: Will the Prime Minister ask one or more of the learned Gentlemen who sit behind him on occasion to attend these Grand Committees on behalf of the Government?

Mr. ASQUITH: I believe they do, as a matter of fact, attend.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state when the Report stage of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill will be taken.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg also to ask the Prime Minister, when the Report stage of the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill will be taken; and whether, in view of the limited time remaining at the disposal of Parliament this Session, the Government will reconsider their determination to reinsert on Report certain proposals not touching the principle of the measure, and rejected by the Grand Committee after very full and adequate discussion.

Mr. ASQUITH: The Government hope soon to proceed with the Report Stage of this Bill, but I cannot yet name any date. As to the second part of the second Question I can give no pledge.

Stipendiary Curates.

Mr. RADFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been directed to cases of hardship arising from the operation of the 95th section of 1 and 2 Vict., c. 106, which enables a newly-appointed incumbent of a parish to dismiss the assistant stipendiary curates, although holding the bishop's licence, at six weeks' notice without reason assigned; and whether he will take steps to amend the law so as to secure to assistant stipendiary curates greater security of tenure in their posts.

Mr. ASQUITH: No cases of hardship arising from the operation of this Act have been brought to my notice; and, as at present advised, I see no reason for taking steps to amend the law on this subject.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): There are two points I want to put to the Prime Minister in connection with the business of the House. The first is a special point relating to the Education Bill. The right hon. Gentleman has informed the House he intends to take the Second Reading on Wednesday. Has he considered the very special peculiar circumstances attending the introduction of that Bill? It was put in on Friday without any statement at all. Only two or three days are to elapse between this technical First Reading and the substantial debate on the Second Reading, and it is not possible for Members of this House to receive adequate information as to the way the proposals of the Government are received throughout the country in time to form an opinion upon the Second Reading. Very earnestly I press upon the consideration of the Prime Minister whether it would not be more consonant with the general convenience of the House that this Second Reading should be put off until Monday next. Then as to my second point. The Government have introduced a new and very important measure in the middle of an autumn session, and, whereas we were left in some doubt before as to what was likely to be the general course of public business until the House is prorogued, such doubt as we had before is now intensified, and I cannot now conjecture what the scheme of the Government is as to the business for the remainder of the session. It would be a great advantage to every individual Member if the right hon. Gentleman could give us some forecast as to the manner in which he proposes to divide the time of the session amongst the various projects of the Government and how long he thinks the autumn session is likely to last.

Mr. ASQUITH: With regard to the first of the right hon. Gentleman's Questions, I must say that the Government regard it as essential, if the Education Bill is to go through, as they hope it may, with something approaching general consent, that we should get the Second Reading of the Bill this week. If that is so, I think it would be to the advantage of the House and in the interests of general discussion that we should be able to devote two full Parliamentary nights to it—Wednesday and Thursday. As at present advised, having regard to the very long discussion which has taken place in this House and in the country as to the main points involved, and the detailed Memorandum which was circulated with the Bill on Saturday morning, I do not think any substantial advantage would be gained by postponing the opening of the Second Reading debate for one day. As to the more general Question put to me by the right hon. Gentleman, I had no notice of it, and it is one which requires very careful consideration. I do not think I can be expected, therefore, to make any definite statement as to the allocation of time during the remainder of the session until we know, at any rate, what are to be the fortunes of the Licensing Bill elsewhere. At present we do not know that. Obviously that must have a great effect upon the allocation of time in this House, but I will make a statement at the earliest possible moment.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester), speaking on behalf of the Roman Catholic community, which he said would have to give the Bill the most resolute and determined opposition, urged the Prime Minister in common fairness to allow them a little more time before taking the Second Reading. It was of extreme importance for these education questions to be discussed, and it was impossible for the community he represented to get up their case by Wednesday.

MR. ASQUITH: I am most anxious to consult the special wishes of the community the noble Lord represents, but I imagine the points on which they are specially concerned are rather Committee points than Second Reading points.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT: Surely Monday will be much too early to take the Committee stage.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would not be in order for me to discuss the decision arrived at by the right hon. Gentleman. But, in view of the special circumstances, will not the Prime Minister lay upon the Table of the House a Paper giving in a clear and detailed form the financial operations and results this Bill will have upon the fortunes of the various classes of schools concerned?

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education is not here at present, but I think we will be able to do that. I will do my best.

MR. BELLOC, as an English Catholic representative, pressed for more time to be allowed before the Second Reading of the Education Bill was taken.

MR. ASQUITH: I can only repeat that I think the points the community my hon. friend represents are interested in are points more for Committee than for Second Reading.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, with Amendments.

IRISH LAND.

*THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The task which confronts me this afternoon is not only a most difficult and most complicated one, but also by far the most responsible task I have ever been called upon to handle during my years of office, few and evil though those years may have been. The difficulty and complication of my task is increased by the fact that the soil I am required to till this afternoon is by no means virgin soil. It has been turned up again and again by the plough-shares of all my predecessors. The responsibility of the task is increased by the fact that the whole peace and prosperity of Ireland is irrevocably bound up in, and has been made by previous action of the Imperial Parliament almost wholly dependent upon, the success of that policy of land purchase on the terms of which something like one-half of the agricultural land of Ireland has passed, or is in course of passing, from landlord to occupier. That that policy may be open to criticism I am not here to doubt, but by the common consent of all critics, whether native or foreign, it is admitted that wherever this policy has had a fair chance, and it is not in all parts of Ireland that it has had that chance, it has already worked exceeding great marvels. Although we are dealing with a process that must take a long time, even already that process has changed the face of Ireland. That is a very gratifying thought to every one. To do anything that would arrest the progress of land purchase would be a blunder—economic and political—of the very first magnitude. The object of the Government is to do all it can to hasten the progress of land purchase in Ireland and to make it work, as it was originally intended to do, fairly all round, and to accomplish that end the Government will not hesitate to invite the House of Commons to consider proposals which will materially add to the already heavy existing burdens upon the Imperial Exchequer. There is no occasion for me now to go further back into history than 25th March, 1903, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover introduced his Bill which ultimately became the Land Act of that year. The hour was in many respects opportune. Birds of peace brooded over the usually troubled Irish waters, and a bargain was struck across the floor of this House to which practically all parties assented. Let me invite the House to consider what that bargain was. As between the landlord and tenant it was a purely voluntary matter; there was no compulsion in the Bill at all. Landlord and tenant were left at liberty to come to their own terms, and if these terms fell within certain limits known as the zones the Land Commission are required to make the necessary advances. Land purchase was already in progress, though slow, under several Acts of Parliament, and as the main and proper object of the Bill was to do something to make land purchase go more quickly, naturally the promoters of the measure looked about to discover some temptations or inducements—whatever may be the right term—to hold out to both parties in this contract—for, of course, in Irish land purchase the only parties are the landlord and the tenant—to come together and conclude a bargain. What were these inducements or temptations? First, as to the landlord. He was to be paid—when he could get his money—in cash whatever number of years purchase he could persuade his tenants to give; and in addition to the purchase money, and in proportion to the amount of the purchase money, he was to receive in gold a bonus calculated at the rate of 12 per cent. upon his purchase price; and this bonus was to go straight into the pocket of the landlord, although in most cases in Ireland he is only a tenant for life. Of course, in the case of settled estates the purchase money went into settlement and became subject to the trusts of the settlement, and after the satisfaction of the life-interest went to the remainder-man or whoever was the person entitled. The bonus, as I have said, varied in proportion to the price of the purchase. The Duke of Leinster got £80,000 in cash as bonus for the voluntary purchase by his tenants upon terms which, no doubt, fully represented the value of his property. Therefore it cannot be denied—indeed, it was the plain object of the transaction—that the bonus afforded an enormous inducement to the landlord to sell. On the other side of the contract is the tenant. What was offered to him? There was offered to him an immediate and substantial reduction in his rent, even though they were judicial rents, either first-term rents, as they are called, or second-term rents. Under the zone system, if the purchasing annuity which the tenants was to pay was less, within certain limits, than the judicially fixed rent, the bargain went through and the Land Commission had nothing whatever to say to it, but had to advance the purchase money as a matter of course. The effect, therefore, was that in all cases the tenant obtained a substantial reduction on his rent, calculated in the case of first term rents to amount on an average to 5s. 9d. in the £, and in the case of second term rents to 4s. in the £. It must be remembered that the purchasing tenant gives up his right to go into the Court every fifteen years and do his best to obtain a revision of his rent. But he gets this immediate reduction; he gets rid of his flesh and blood landlord—a great thing in his eyes—and he has the hope of a freehold dangling before him. I do not think we should be wise to disregard that hope as a factor in the case. Some people say: "What does it matter to a man that in sixty-eight years he will have a freehold?" But people who say that disregard some of the motives which operate upon Irish tenants. Well, these are the attractions, and no one can deny that they are considerable. Then came the elementary question—Who was to provide the golden sovereigns to supply the purchase money and the bonus? Obviously the tenant was not in a position to do so. As purchaser, he was to pay an annuity of less amount than his previous rent; but he was not meant to lay down large sums of money. The cash with which to pay the landlord was raised by the exercise of British credit. In other words, it was enticed or allured out of the pockets of the investor, who every now and again had offered to him guaranteed stock at $2\frac{3}{4}$, redeemable at par on the expiration of thirty years from the commencement of the Act. There is no better security in the world. I take no responsibility in offering that advice. No risk; a comparatively high rate of interest; the most immaculate security in the world; but, alas! subject to those fluctuations of the money market which no rhetoric can control, and which certainly do not seem to be subject to patriotic considerations. The most autocratic Government in the world, or the most democratic Government in the world—and I do not know which is the more tyrannical of the two—has never yet been able to discover a means whereby to compel the investor to give £100 in cash for £100 in stock. The thing cannot be done. As I say, the bargain was to pay the landlord in cash, cash that was to be raised by the issue of stock fluctuating day by day, week by week, month by month in the market. What the tenant does is to repay the purchase price of his holding. You cannot expect him to do anything else. Assume the price of his holding to be £100. He repays that with a scrupulous fidelity which everyone admires by means of an annuity of £3 5s. 0d. which includes the £2 15s. 0d. interest paid to the investor, and is in addition to form a sinking fund. That works out in this way—at the end of sixty-eight and a half years the stock will be amortised or got rid of by these payments, which, as I have said, the tenant has hitherto made with the most commendable alacrity. Now, as this annuity is only just sufficient to pay the interest on the stock and provide a small sinking fund, we have no margin left for what is called excess stock or for incidental charges. It was, therefore, obvious that over and above the bonus of £12,000,000—which was a free gift—a great risk of loss to the Exchequer was immanent from the very beginning. What was to happen if in order to get a hundred golden sovereigns for the landlord the Treasury have to issue excess stock to the tune of £13 for every £100? Who is to pay the interest on that excess stock for the sixty-eight and a half years? Not the tenant, of course. It is enough for him to pay the $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. annuity on the price of his holding. Some one or something had to be found to take over the responsibility of this prospective loss. By an Act of Parliament which was passed contemporaneously with the Land Act of 1903 the Ireland Development Grant was constituted, which represents the equivalent grant to Ireland in respect of education and was somewhat ironically dedicated to that purpose. The Land Act of 1903 declared that this part must, in the first instance, bear any prospective loss of this character. The Ireland Development Grant is £185,000 a year. By the Act two statutory charges were placed upon it—£20,000 a year to the Congested Districts Board and £5,000 a year to Trinity College, Dublin—which reduces it to £160,000 a year. But since the Act was passed the Ireland Development Grant has been made somewhat of a beast of burden. There have been placed upon it not merely capital charges, but annually recurring charges to the tune of some £60,000 a year. Training colleges, £4,000 a year; salaries to assistant teachers, £34,000 a year; salaries to junior assistant mistresses, £13,000 a year; technical instruction, £7,000 a year—and there is a dredger, a most important thing; do not let any one laugh at a dredger, at £2,000 a year—are placed upon this grant, and you will agree that these are charges which cannot possibly be got rid of. Therefore, I do not think you can estimate the Ireland Development Grant, available for the purposes of the Act of 1903, at a higher figure than £100,000 a year. The Act of 1903 then went on to say that on the absorption of that sum any further loss was to be thrown upon certain grants, called the guarantee fund, which are made annually from the Exchequer in relief of the Irish rates. Consequently, subject to the plunder of the Ireland Development Grant, the cost of any prospective loss was to be thrown upon the Irish ratepayers, as were also all charges which might be incurred by arrears on the part of the tenants in paying their annuities; and as to these latter I think they were properly thrown upon the Irish ratepayers. Such was the bargain of 1903. We are now in November, 1908; and I ask myself what has happened? I remember that a former leader of the Tory Party remarked in one of his novels that the least event was, in his judgment, of greater importance than the most sublime and comprehensive speculation. I do not share that view. But everyone will agree that events, particularly in matters of finance, are of startling interest. Up to date there have been ten issues of Irish land stock. Six have been taken up by the National Debt Commissioners at the certified price of the day, thereby saving to some extent what are called incidental charges, but not saving, of course, the loss on the issue of excess stock. The other four issues have been taken up by the public. All have been issued at a loss. The highest price ever obtained was 92 in April, 1906, and the lowest price was 84¾ in July, 1907. To-day the price in the market is just a little over 87. The stock actually issued amounts, in round numbers, to £33,200,000. Of that, £3,000,000 has been allotted to the purposes of the bonus. I may say that the bonus of £12,000,000 is raised in the same way by the issue of this land stock, although, of course, the interest and sinking fund upon it are borne by Parliament. This left £30,000,000 odd for the purposes of Irish land purchase. But the £30,000,000 of stock only realised in cash £26,500,000. The excess stock is the difference between the two—£3,504,000. Now, this sum of £3,504,000 is the capital amount of the existing charge, first on the Irish Development Grant, and subsequently upon the Irish ratepayers, and it represents—not at present, but it very shortly will do—an annuity at 3¼ per cent. for sixty-eight and a half years of £113,901. Consequently the balance of the Irish Development Grant may be said to be already gone; certainly any fresh issue of stock will more than absorb the balance and will bring the guarantee fund, the ratepayer, into play. So far I have dealt with the issue of the stock; I come now to ask how much has actually been done in the way of land purchase, which, after all, is the problem, and how much remains to be done. Under the Act of 1903 up to the 31st of last month completed transactions represented a sum of £25,000,000 odd. That sum has been actually advanced. What about pending transactions—and by pending transactions we mean agreements which have been lodged, for direct sale from landlords to tenants, for sales to the Estates Commissioners, and also for sales to the Congested Districts Board? These agreements represent £52,000,000; so that these two figures make up £77,000,000. Now how much remains outside? The right hon. Member for Dover, advised by his experts, came to the conclusion—it was no more than an estimate—that the extent of the problem with which he had to grapple was represented by £100,000,000, and it was upon that estimate that he fixed his limit, for limit it was, of £12,000,000 by way of bonus. In considering that the right hon. Gentleman had, of course, to speculate about the price Irish land was likely to obtain under the provisions of the Bill, and undoubtedly prices have ranged a great deal higher than was within the dream of his philosophy or I think within the expectation of any of the parties to that celebrated land conference. It is one of those ironical facts which I give over to the consideration of the Member for Preston, that one effect of our interference and of the employment of British credit, and certainly of the zones, has been very much indeed to increase the price of Irish land. However that may be, the right hon. Gentleman acting upon his advice, as I have to act upon mine, made his shot, and his shot was £100,000,000. Now, I am told by my advisers—who are, I daresay, the same as those who advised him, of course with the experience of what has since happened—that that was an exceedingly bad shot, and there is very little doubt in the opinion of my advisers that the total he ought to have named, could he have foreseen the future, was not £100,000,000, but £180,000,000. ["Oh."] I am quite prepared to lay upon the Table of the House the method of the calculation upon which that is based. Do not suppose I have any interest, God forbid, in extolling the magnitude of the problem. The smaller it is the better I shall be pleased; I can only act upon information placed within my reach. If these figures are correct, we have £52,000,000 to raise to get rid of the pending agreements, and we have to raise a further £100,000,000. If prices rule on the market at the average price since Irish Land stock came into existence—$88\frac{5}{16}$—the excess stock, in order to raise £152,000,000 cash, will be £20,000,000, and the annual charge upon this excess stock will ultimately amount to £760,000. Now deduct from that the £100,000 of the Ireland Development Grant and you get the somewhat startling figure of £660,000 a year chargeable upon Irish rates. Of course, not at once, but eventually. That will be the annual cost of the excess stock which nobody pays interest upon.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover): The amount to be raised still is £152,000,000, but if £25,000,000 has to be deducted and your estimate is £180,000,000 should not the amount to be raised be £155,000,000 and not £152,000,000?

*MR. BIRRELL: That is quite true, I took £100,000,000 as the estimate and this turns out to be rather more.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (London): How much is to fall on the ratepayers?

*MR. BIRRELL: It would be £660,000 a year eventually if the present system went on. That would be the interest upon the excess stock which nobody pays. In other words, the amount would fall upon the Ireland Development Grant and the Irish ratepayers.

MR. WYNDHAM: In making that calculation the right hon. Gentleman must have formed an estimate of the average price at which stock will be issued during the whole period. Is he taking the present figure?

*MR. BIRRELL: I took it at $88\frac{5}{16}$, which is the average price of issue of the stock up to the present. No doubt, as time goes on, and when the issue of the stock ceases, and when the Sinking Fund comes into operation, always assuming that this country maintains its equipoise, the price will have a tendency to rise, but for our immediate purposes, and for the next decade, we shall be very rash if we assume that it is likely to improve very much upon the average price of $88\frac{5}{16}$. These figures do not, of course, include the bonus. The bonus of the right hon. Gentleman was limited to 12 per cent. on the £100,000,000. Of course, you cannot add a penny to the £12,000,000 without coming to Parliament for a grant. If Parliament were so minded as to continue the bonus upon the new lot which it paid upon the old lot, then in addition we should have to find £7,200,000 more in cash, and on that you would have to bear a similar loss on excess stock. I have reminded the House of the terms of the bargains of 1903, and I have told the House what has actually happened since it was entered into. Now I am faced with the problem, what are we to do? There are three things to be dealt with. There is the £52,000,000 on pending agreements, nearly all for direct sale. I do not wonder at the complaints which have come from the landlords and in a less degree from the tenants. The landlords have got a very good bargain, but they are kept out of it. They have money in prospect and it is a good thing to have money in prospect. Some of us have not even that. But when you have parted with your land it is natural that you should want to see the money for it. In the same way, the tenant under a majority of the agreements has to pay the landlord pending the advance of the purchase money $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. by way of interest.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): They must pay 3½ per cent. That is the minimum.

*MR. BIRRELL: Yes. Sometimes it is as much as 4 per cent. At any rate, it is more by ¼ per cent. than his annuity, consequently he also suffers. If you take the rate of purchase in Ireland at twenty-four and a half years of second term rents, which I am advised is really below the average, this gives the owner where his interest in lieu of rent is 3½ per cent. £86 for every £100 of his gross rent, and where it is 3¾ per cent. he gets £92 for every £100 of his gross rent, and, as 10 per cent. has always been allowed as representing the cost of collection, the average selling landlord at the lower rate only loses 4 per cent. upon his net rent, and at the higher rate he makes a slight gain. The real disadvantage of his position is that he is often heavily mortgaged and has to pay interest at the rate of 4½ and sometimes of 5 per cent. Consequently he is badly off, because of the heavy interest on his mortgages. But I may point out that he was always in that position. And as regards the tenant, although it is quite true he has to pay 3½ per cent. instead of 3¼, he nevertheless does obtain by virtue of the bargain an immediate and very considerable reduction—some shillings in the £—of his annual outgoings. Therefore, as compared with the position before the bargain was struck, he is better off.

MR. WYNDHAM: The right hon. Gentleman must take into account the fact that during the intermediate period before the sale is concluded the landlord is managing his estate and collects his rents. After the sale is concluded the instalments are collected by the State, but between the agreement being signed and the conclusion of the matter the landlord has to collect them. ["No, no."]

*MR. BIRRELL: I do not understand that to be the case. I have always understood that the moment a bargain was struck the Land Commissioners took over the recovery of the rent, and did that free, and the landlords got 3½ per cent. clear. But we have to think of other things besides the pending agreements of £53,000,000. We have to consider the purchase work of the Congested Districts Board and of the Estates Commissioners. I cannot allow that, as far as I have any responsibility in the matter, to be suspended until such time as these pending agreements have been cleared off. That, indeed, would be to arrest land purchase in the very direction in which it is most needed. Nobody can deny that, as things have worked out in Ireland, those who might well have been the last have become the first, and those who ought to have been first have been left to the last. Therefore, while recognising the obligation of the State to work off these £53,000,000 of pending agreements, I cannot be a party to any proposal which would suspend land purchase in its most beneficent direction until such time as the exigencies of the money market and the capacity of the Land Commission Office have worked off these pending agreements. Then there is the problem of the land which the landlords have not yet sold, but may be willing to sell. Those are the three things I have to bear in mind—pending agreements, the work of the Congested Districts Board and of the Estate Commissioners, and the landlords still outside contracts. All that the Government can do with the best intentions in the world, is governed by two conditions—I might call them categorical and imperative conditions. One of these is the capacity of the money market to take repeated issues of land stock, and the other is the capacity of the Land Commission to do the work necessarily imposed upon them. Taking the last point first, it is obvious that whatever increase of the staff is made—and an increase there is to be—and whatever modifications of and alterations in the present regulations are made, there is necessarily a limit to the size of a public office, to the expenditure in its administration—already over £175,000 a year—and to the amount of work which it can properly accomplish in any one year. You cannot indefinitely extend an office, you cannot indefinitely extend the expenses of administration, nor can you indefinitely extend the work done at the head by responsible persons. The Treasury have agreed to an increase of staff, and I am now engaged busily with the Land Commissioners in the revision of their rules. I am quite sure a great deal can be done by quickening the inspection of estates, by lessening points of law and points of title, and by enabling the three Commissioners to work separately rather than all together, greatly to increase the output of the office. But, however well these improvements may work, I cannot bring myself honestly to believe that the office is ever likely to do much more than double its present output. I name £10,000,000 a year as a sum to be aimed at, and I believe it can be reached; but beyond that, I cannot believe (I place no limit; there is no need to place any limit) it will ever be capable of doing the work properly. I do not wish to detain the House by describing the work. I am not unacquainted with it, and having regard to the past, and the nature of the problems, I feel sure that £10,000,000 a year is about the utmost they can hope to do. That is the first conclusion. You cannot get rid of it. The second condition is the capacity of the money market to take repeated issues of land stock. I cannot speak with authority upon that, but I know that every large, fresh issue has a bad and most depressing effect on the market. The market has not a voracious appetite; I wish it had. Its stomach soon turns. Those people who talk so glibly of issuing £40,000,000 of stock as if it could be done by a stroke of the pen are not only unmindful of the capacity of the office work of the Commission, but are unmindful of the capacity of the money market to swallow. British credit, after all, must be preserved. We cannot afford to play tricks with it. It will have to be preserved in the best way we possibly can preserve it, for general purposes and for national emergencies. What do we propose to do, working, as we must, subject to those conditions? First of all we put upon the Imperial Exchequer, subject to the Ireland Development Grant, the whole burden of the loss occasioned by the issue of the stock below par—the necessary issue of excess stock—and the bonus dividend. The advance dividend is otherwise provided for. We at once propose, if we obtain the assent of Parliament, to relieve the Irish ratepayers of prospective losses in these respects. By doing that I doubt not we remove a very serious nightmare from their minds, but we assume a very serious responsibility upon the Imperial Exchequer. My figures at all events make that sufficiently plain. I estimate the charge upon the Exchequer in respect of pending agreements to be over £200,000 a year. But let there be no mistake about this matter. It is not the present intention of the Treasury to issue more stock on terms involving loss than will be enough to raise £5,000,000 in cash each year. That was the rate contemplated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite for the first three years of the Act of 1903, though he hoped, if things worked well, to mend the pace later. At present prices it involves a loss, to be borne by the Exchequer, of at least £20,000 a year for every £5,000,000 cash that may be raised. We shall aim at an output of £10,000,000 a year. We propose to offer to the landlords who have pending agreements the option of taking their purchase money in stock at the market price of the day, or at the price of £92, whichever may be the lower, or of taking it partly in stock and partly in cash. The present price of the stock is something over 87, so that if the landlords take 2¾ per cent. stock at 92, the cost to the Exchequer would be £14,000 a year for the sixty-eight and a half years for every £5,000,000 raised. That has to be added to the £20,000 a year loss on the £5,000,000 cash raised per year. But seeing that the work of the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners must go on, £1,000,000 per annum out of the cash raised must be allotted to those departments. I do not say in what proportions now, but there must be a call upon one-fifth of the cash for the purpose of enabling these bodies to transact what, in my judgment, is by far, in the present state of land purchase, the most useful part of the operation. Now, in regard to future transactions. The Bill proposes to take power to issue a new stock at 3 per cent., instead of at the former rate, and thereby necessarily to increase the tenants' annuity—3½ per cent. instead of 3¼. We also take power for temporary borrowing. Landlords must take this 3 per cent. stock at its face value.

MR. WYNDHAM: If they do not like I presume they need not?

*MR. BIRRELL: For future transactions they will have to take the 3 per cent. stock.

MR. WYNDHAM: Therefore, on the basis the right hon. Gentleman has described, the £5,000,000 is only for existing transactions.

*MR. BIRRELL: That is so. As to the bonus I have already indicated its nature. It was a 12 per cent. bonus calculated on an estimate of £100,000,000 but the House will clearly understand that by the Act of 1903, £12,000,000 was the limit. It was to go round, whatever happened. Under the 48th section of the Act of 1903, subsection (3), it was provided that after the expiration of five years from the commencement of that Act, and thereafter at each quinquennial period the Treasury might revise the percentage for the purpose of adjusting the relation between the unexpended balance of the fund and the claims made upon it. The revision of percentage was to apply to all agreements entered into after the date of its having been made. The five years came to an end on Sunday, 1st November, and as that day grew near the anxiety of the landlords to obtain this increased bonus became feverish. They spurred their agents and attorneys to unwonted exertions, and on the last two days, the Friday and Saturday of a busy week, agreements were lodged in the office exceeding in amount £5,000,000, bringing up the total of pending agreements to £52,000,000. Without legislation not one penny could be added to the £12,000,000 bonus, and pending legislation the percentage must be revised for the next five years so as to go round to the best of our calculations. Who are the present claimants of the money? It has generally been assumed in Ireland that the right to this bonus, until revised, accrues, in the case at all events, of direct sales, whenever the agreement with the tenants of particular holdings are lodged, subject, of course, to the condition subsequent that the estate of which the holdings formed part should be declared an estate within the meaning of the Act. I am advised by my right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland, and if he does not know the Irish Land Acts his has indeed been a wasted life, most melancholy in retrospect, and also by the Solicitor-General, that in their view only those landlords are actually at the present moment entitled to this unrevised bonus who lodged all their agreements before 1st November, and that the mere lodging of agreements for some of the holdings on a particular estate would not bring them within the purview of the whole bonus. That, as I have been advised, is the law, but it is not a view of the law on which I am at all anxious to take a stand, because, educated, as I had the good fortune to be, in Courts of equity, the best school of virtue in the world, I am bound to say that I think the "truth and honour of the transaction," as we say in those Courts, is rather in the other direction. I have had a little pleasant intercourse with the Treasury on that point, and they are quite willing to make it clear in the Bill that those landlords who have already lodged some of their agreements shall, in the event of an estate being subsequently declared an estate within Section 98 of the Act, be allowed to take a bonus at the old rate. But the Attorney-General insists in advising me that "the truth and honour of the transaction" would not prevail in the absence of legal provisions to that effect. On the footing of providing for these £52,000,000 as a whole there will still be left of the right hon. Gentleman's £12,000,000 a sum of £3,000,000, not more, perhaps hardly that, to provide a bonus for future applicants. Remembering what I have already said, it is quite plain that the Treasury must at once, and without waiting for legislation, revise this bonus and cut it down to the figure of 3 per cent., and such an order will accordingly appear in to-morrow's Dublin *Gazette*. If, however, Parliament is willing to come to our assistance in this matter and enable us to pass this measure or something like it, after full consideration we are quite prepared to increase the limit of £12,000,000 and add materially to the bonus for the landlords who remain to be dealt with.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To what extent?

*MR. BIRRELL: I will tell you in a moment. The whole subject of what is a bonus has, I confess, agitated my mind considerably. It is not, surely, a bribe to the life tenant to put money in his own pocket at the expense of those coming after him. I decline to consider that as being the basis of a bonus. The value of the land is ascertained apart from the bonus. I quite understand what the bonus was for. It was intended to supply a cash medium to bridge over the possible inability of the landlord, owing to the circumstances in which he found himself, to accept the fair value of his estate. He might agree that a certain amount was the fair value of the estate, but he was so involved one way and another that without the assistance of some cash in his pocket he would prefer to remain on in his present awkward position than to take the mere fair price of his property. This inability, which I recognise, presses far more heavily upon the poorer landlord of poor land which is heavily mortgaged than upon the owners of land that they can sell at twenty-five years purchase. Therefore I should think that the basis upon which the bonus was given in the Bill of 1903 was, if the right hon. Gentleman will permit me to say so, a thoroughly bad one. It went upon the principle of giving to those who did not need it and withholding from those who did. I cannot understand how any human being could wish to give the Duke of Leinster £80,000 for selling excellent property on which there was no trouble whatever at a high number of years purchase, voluntarily and without compulsion—I cannot understand a bonus based upon these principles. We propose, therefore, that the bonus shall be graduated and devoted so far as possible to enable poorer landlords to sell. As something may be said of the temptation it puts in the way of the poorer landlord to cheat his remainder-men, if anybody makes a suggestion that the bonus should be partially set aside and held over for the benefit of the remainder-men I shall have no objection. We propose to graduate the bonus in order to aid the poor landlord to sell. Our proposals come to this—that the lower down you go in the scale of years of purchase the higher will be the bonus. At the bottom of the scale will be a 16 per cent. bonus, and the scale is graduated until at twenty-five years purchase and upwards the bonus is nothing at all.

I will proceed now to the second part of my task, which involves a question of even greater difficulty and at least equal responsibility. The financial problem and the administrative problem will, I think, be recognised as, after all, questions of time and patience. We all want to see peace in our own time in Ireland, and are most anxious, if we can, to settle this tremendous question in the shortest possible space of time. But everybody who knows anything about money, law, and land will agree that you will have to wait. Therefore, time and patience are the very essence of the consideration of the financial problem. When I come to the question of the relief of congestion in the west it is not merely a question of time and patience, it is also a question of policy. The whole of this most difficult problem was in 1906 referred to a Commission presided over by Lord Dudley. I know that he is suspect in certain quarters with regard to bis political opinions, but surely nobody will deny, and particularly now that he has gone from that West Atlantic and is "by the long wash of Australasian seas," that he devoted to this task pains and self-sacrifice which in a man of his position and past habits of life I have never seen equalled. He threw himself into it and worked and slaved, and, quite apart from any political opinions, he is entitled, especially when he is serving the Empire abarod, to the thanks and consideration of tbis House. The other Commissioners wree all distinguished men. They held 116 public sittings, spent 48 days in travelling all over the country, with four motor cars, examined 560 witnesses, asked 60,386 questions, and the answers are to be found recorded, and the House will eagerly seek them, in 11 volumes of evidence. In addition, there are 1,779 pages of memoranda, synopses, diagrams, and the like. I can only say that that Commission attracted an enormous amount of attention and excited great interest in Ireland, and if this House, or any Ministers, imagine that they can refer a question of such vital importance and deep interest to a Commission of this character and then pay no attention to their Report they are repeating the evil behaviour for which, unfortunately, there are some precedents in the past. It is impossible within the limits of a speech to give even a general idea of the substance of the Report, but I can state in a few words what is the problem that has been so elaborately reported upon. It is this. More than one-sixth of the total area of Ireland is already, under Acts of Parliament, for the first of which the Leader of the Opposition is responsible, scheduled as congested. The right hon. Gentleman brought in the first Congested Districts Act. I hope I have no envy in my disposition, but I should have been pleased to share the credit for that Act with him. But, as I was saying, more than one-sixth of Ireland is already scheduled as congested. That is a phrase which means an electoral division where the average rateable valuation per head of the population is under 30s. and where one-fifth of the total population of the county in which that electoral division is situate live in divisions of the same character as to rateable value. Here you have poverty staring you in the face. Three and a half millions of acres are already scheduled with a population of 500,000 and over. According to the census of 1901, 507,000 people—one-ninth of the whole population of Ireland, were living on holdings which represent only one twenty-seventh of the valuation of Ireland. The valuation of the holdings of those 507,000 people is only £577,000. Nine-tenths of this population live on holdings of an average valuation of £6, as compared with a general average valuation of £22. But it does not stop there. Half of those holdings are under £4; in fact, £3 17s. represents the average annual Poor Law valuation of half of these holdings, and to make matters worse, the arrangements are impossible.

"Not only" says the Report on page 5 "are most of the holdings in the scheduled districts quite inadequate in size, at any rate in regard to the cultivated land, but many of them are also arranged in a way that makes good agriculture impossible. On many estates in the West, especially where the houses are clustered together in 'villages,' and where the people have been in occupation for generations, the land is held in rundale—a survival according to some authorities of the old communal or tribal system of land-holding —and in other parts the people have sub-divided the holdings from time to time in their own way, in consequence of which their holdings now consist of intermixed plots. The result is that the farm of one tenant often consists not of one or two or even three separate portions of land, but of many detached plots within fenced fields scattered amongst similar fragments of other holdings. A field of one acre may belong to a dozen persons, each of whom has a plot of his own while the land is under cultivation, and very frequently matters are still further complicated by various fractions of plots being held in 'undivided shares.' As might be expected, under such conditions agriculture is extremely backward in many places. Most of the holdings consist mainly of rough grazing land, and potatoes and oats are the only crops usually grown. The methods of cultivation are primitive,with but little rotation of crops, insufficient drainage, and inadequate manuring. The breeds of live stock were worn out and of little value in the poorest districts when the Board commenced operations, and though there has been considerable improvement, much remains to be done, and progress in this respect is of great importance, as the calf or yearling that the average small occupier at present sells is often his main source of income."

It goes on at page 7:—

"The outstanding feature of the congested districts, and indeed of the greater part of the nine counties which contain such districts, is not an excessive population, but first a fairly dense population in certain areas, mostly along the sea coast, where the land is hardly capable of supporting any population at all, and, secondly, excessive population in districts mainly consisting of poor land, but adjacent to extremely thinly-populated districts of better land."

This is the issue which I want to put before the House and before Ireland with as much clearness as I possibly can. If this poverty is to be relieved, if this peasantry is to be saved, if the task begun in 1891 is to be continued, two things must be forthcoming. There must be the land to improve the conditions of the holdings, and there must be instruction to teach these poor people, when they have been put upon better holdings, how to live and how to make the most of what must always be in any circumstances a precarious and difficult mode of life. Unless you can find the land and unless you can give the instruction, it is cruelty to touch the problem at all. The people must either starve or emigrate. This is no new thing. The hope that this task should be done goes back before the days when the right hon. Gentleman introduced his Bill, and I hope that this time, at any rate, we shall be able to give effect to those hopes and wishes. The only land available for the increase of holdings in the west is the untenanted land sometimes called the grass lands. We shall be told that to advocate the policy which I certainly do advocate, and which the Report of the Commissioners advocates, involves the breaking up of those great grazing lands of the west. Well, so it does. Thereby, say some people, you will ruin the cattle trade, which is admittedly one of the great industries of Ireland. I hope, before people come to that conclusion, that they will read those pages of the Report which deal with that subject——a Report in which Sir John Colomb joined, but to which he added an interesting and well-reasoned Memorandum, putting the difficulties as strongly as they could possibly be put. I invite the whole House to read not only the Report, but his own separate Memorandum, and I think they will find that they are hasty in assuming that the breaking up of these grass lands in the west will strike a heavy blow, if a blow at all, at the cattle trade. The solution will be found in mixed farms—small farms partly tilled and partly in grass. I beseech hon. Members to consider these things before making up their minds definitely about it. Even assuming the worst that can be said, and the worst is this, that possibly the breaking up of these grass lands in the west might interfere with the full progress and the full prosperity of the cattle trade to some extent—even admitting that, I say there is no help for it. What are you going to do? Are you committed to the policy of improving these uneconomic holdings? If you are, you want the land. You have got to make up your mind between the cattle and the people. Are the people to give way to the cattle or the cattle to give way to the people? We cast our vote on the side of the people, and I say that in so doing we are not departing from or reversing any policy whatsoever of the right hon. Gentleman or anybody else opposite, because, if it is to be our policy that the uneconomic holdings of these people are to be increased from £3 17s. rateable value to something like £10 or under, you have got to get this land or to give up hope. It is not a matter at all for surprise that the whole body of the Commissioners should have reported that, if these holdings are to be increased at all, you must have every acre of untenanted land that you can lay your hands on, at all events west of the Shannon. In order to get it, the Commissioners unanimously reported, subject to certain conditions, that compulsory powers should be granted. The Government propose to invite this House to grant these powers. But the problem does not stop there. The land hunger in Ireland is universal. As originally devised, the Land Purchase Acts were confined to dealing with the actual landlords deriving rent from actual tenants paying rent and in occupation of their holdings. But the Act of 1903 broke down that limitation. Outsiders were included within some of the benefits. The Estates Commissioners were authorised to buy estates as a whole in the west and elsewhere and to resell them, and in reparcelling the untenanted land they were to consider not only the relief of congestion, but to divide the untenanted land amongst other classes defined in the Act. Many people who were in no sense of the word congested tenants have shared in the division of untenanted land. Hopes have been excited; land-hungry eyes have been greedily cast on the untenanted land by persons living in the district; they have marked them out for their own. Parochialism has prevailed over nationalism in this matter. The sons of the farmers have asked why they should be passed over in favour of those whom they may in their parochialism regard as strangers. I will go no further into that question. In my judgment it is one which Ireland ought to have the opportunity of settling for herself. We cannot do good at the point of the bayonet. We cannot maintain an army of police offering protection to migrants, [as in the old days they offered protection to landlords and their agents. We propose, in accordance with the Report of the Commission, to reconstruct the Congested Districts Board. We propose to enlarge its area in the manner which the majority suggest. We propose greatly to increase its statutory income, and to give it within its extended area the first call upon all the land within that area. We propose to confer upon it compulsory powers for the acquisition of land for the relief of congestion within its area. Some of its present powers we propose to transfer to the Department of Agriculture. Before stating in a little more detail what our proposals are, I want to say this, that these proposals are what seemed to us, after much consideration and reflection, fair and practicable proposals, but the Government has no other desire than to enlist on behalf of the West of Ireland the sympathy and support of all lovers of Ireland; and whilst fully determined to do whatever we can to continue the work of the relief of these people by making their holdings economic and improving their education, we shall always be ready and perfectly willing to consider, without wounded pride or personal consideration, any suggestions coming from Ireland that are honestly intended to effect the accomplishment of what I hope is a common object. We propose to incorporate the Congested Districts Board. We propose that from and after the appointed day the Congested Districts Board shall consist of three *ex officio* members, the Chief Secretary, the Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, and the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture; five appointed persons nominated by His Majesty; nine persons representing the congested districts counties' one being elected by the local authority of each congested district county; and at least one person to be appointed by His Majesty as a permanent and paid member. We propose that there should be an administrative committee of this Board, which shall consist of the Chief Secretary, the Under-Secretary, the paid member, and one member of the Board not being an *ex officio* member, to be chosen by the appointed and representative members. On this administrative committee would devolve the obligations relating to finance; the Committee would, in short, control the finance of the Board. Subject to such control, the Board would have power to determine all matters relating to the purchase and resale of land and the aiding and developing of industries and fishing. We propose that the statutory income of this Board should be increased from £186,500 a year to £250,000. That may seem a large or a small sum, according as you view the nature of the transactions of this body, but if it is to work at all, it can only work at very considerable expense. It has to acquire properties under the operations of the Land Purchase Acts. It has to fit them for occupation by the congested persons. It has to enlarge the holdings, and to go to considerable expense in buildings and the like; and however carefully this £250,000 a year is husbanded, and even if every penny of it is wisely spent, it will undoubtedly take some twenty years at the very least before the task can be said to be in any way accomplished. And, therefore, large or small as the sum is conceived to be, it is at all events not large enough to do more than enable this work to be carried out within a generation yet to come. We propose to increase the area of the Board. It will comprise the whole of the counties of Donegal, Sligo, Leitrim, Roscommon, Mayo, Galway, Clare, and Kerry, and certain rural districts in the western part of Cork. Now we come to the question of the transfer of certain of the powers of the Congested Districts Board to the Board of Agriculture. We propose that the powers and duties now conferred on the Congested Districts Board for the purpose of aiding and developing agriculture, forestry, the breeding of live stock and poultry, and the provision of seed potatoes and seed oats shall on the appointed day be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. In this connection I must put in a word here, or I shall get into trouble with the Treasury. The £250,000 I have indicated as the increased income of the Board is to be given on the footing that it does all that work, and consequently, if any part of the work is transferred to another Department, there will have to be an adjustment as between the two Departments. Then we propose to take powers for the compulsory acquisition of land within the area of the Congested Districts Board, and we propose to exclude the Estates Commissioners from making purchases within the congested districts, unless with the consent of the Congested Districts Board. In other words, the Congested Districts Board is to have the first call upon the land within its area. Two things are noticeable in this matter. I have not attempted in this Bill to lay down rules for estimating the value of an estate. Those who have read the Report will know that there is a very elaborate contrivance laid down in it for the purpose of estimating what is called the net profit income of the land. I have read it over and over again until my head ached, and I am bound to say that, speaking of it with all respect, sometimes I thought I had grasped it, and then it eluded me, and I found it impossible to introduce it into the Bill. Because, after all, in the case of occupied land, the rental value must be the main basis in estimating the value of an estate. If you want to buy an estate, you ask what value it is to its owner, how much does it leave after he has paid for the collection of *his* rents and made other allowances, how much comes to fructify in his breeches' pockets? With that object you take into consideration the surroundings and position of the estate, what are called the amenities of the estate, whether it has a town or market near it, and so on. I quite agree with Sir John Colomb when he says, in the Report—

> "I can see no reason why, because the land is in Ireland, its owner should suffer any disabilities from which ownership of land in England, Scotland, or Wales is exempt. If the State takes land away from an owner in Ireland it should, as regards price and conditions, be subject to the decisions of a Court of Arbitrators as qualified, and commanding as much public confidence for impartiality and freedom from administrative influence, as in Great Britain.'

But I think Sir John Colomb is mistaken if he thinks that arbitration in England always succeeds in giving satisfaction to all the parties. I have been an arbitrator over and over again, but I cannot lay to myself the flattering unction that in my Reports I always gave satisfaction to both sides. It is only because in Ireland such a fierce light beats upon the arbitrator, and everybody is so interested in the land, that great nervousness exists upon this question. The problem of fixing value is a very difficult problem. It can never be done to absolute mathematical perfection. All you can do is to secure, as far as you can, that you have honest and competent men—not necessarily lawyers—but competent men who are not influenced either by the administration or by hopes of promotion, or by vulgar considerations of that sort, but bend their minds honestly for the purpose of considering what is the value of the land. Having discovered the value of the land, if you take it compulsorily you must pay cash for it. You cannot pay in stock. I was brought up under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, but I should say if you take away a man's land compulsorily, you must ascertain its value, upon the basis of finding out what it was worth to him, and having come to a decision you must pay him in cash, and I do not think he ought to be kept waiting a very long time for his money. Therefore, in all these cases of compulsion the purchase money will have to come out of the £1,000,000 which is to be set aside out of the £5,000,000. The machinery for compulsory purchase is akin to the machinery under the Evicted Tenants Act, and we propose, if there is no agreement as to price, that the price shall be fixed by the Judicial Commissioner with two lay assessors. That is to be the Court for fixing the price of the land.

MR. WYNDHAM: The final Court?

*MR. BIRRELL: Yes, as to value, but there is to be an appeal on points of law to the Court of Appeal, for instance, as to whether the land proposed to be acquired is a demesne or home farm. With regard to the zones, we do not propose to abolish them. I do not like the zones, because I think that undoubtedly the effect of them has been to raise the price of land. They also take away the control of the State in a matter in which it is deeply and vitally interested —namely, the value of the security, and it is a little strange to me that a mortgagee, so to speak, should not be allowed to form any estimate as to the value of the estate on which he is lending his money. But, as I am doing my best to increase the output of the office, it seems to me that it would be most unreasonable now to increase the work. Two-thirds of the contracts are within the zones. If, therefore, we abolish the zones and throw the work of inspection on the Estates Commissioners, it would treble their work, and that, I think, is most undesirable. At the same time, we do propose to allow the Estates Commissioners, if their attention has been called to particular circumstances as to the inadequacy of the security or to any other circumstances, such as duress or great arrears of rent and the like, in cases within the zones to insist upon examination if they think proper. There are other clauses which deal with important matters. For example, in cases of non-judicial tenancies, and other cases outside the zones, we propose to make important changes. At present in these cases the security has got to be investigated, and if the Land Commission is satisfied with the security and is of opinion that the agreed price is equitable, the advances may be made. The judicial construction which has been placed upon the section of the Act is that in considering whether the price is equitable or not the matter can only be considered with regard to the vendor, that is to say, whether the price is not too low, so as to injure the mortgagees or remainder-men. Cases have occurred where most valuable buildings have been put upon the land by the tenant himself, and yet it has not been possible to consider the equity of the price so far as the tenant is concerned, and he has been made to pay for these buildings over again. That certainly affects the security very materially, and also, I think, was not the intention of the Act. I think when you say the price is to be equitable you mean equitable with regard to all parties, and, therefore, we include a clause giving effect to that view. We propose also to put a limitation upon the amount of advances to one purchaser. The original limit was £3,000; this was raised in exceptional cases, under the Act of 1888, to £5,000, and under the Act of 1903 it was further raised to £7,000. We think the sale of large holdings of this kind ought not to be encouraged. We propose to reduce the amount which may be advanced to any one purchaser to £3,000 as a general rule, allowing in exceptional cases, to resident tenants, an advance of £5,000. We also propose after a particular date to prevent any purchaser from acquiring subsequently a number of purchased holdings and consolidating them. The practice has grown up among landlords with untenanted land on their hands of dividing it up into lots, putting the tenant right up to auction, selling to the highest bidder, and undertaking to sell the fee simple to the new tenant under the Land Purchase Acts. Very high prices have been obtained under this system. All I have to say is that it is not the sort of thing for which British credit should be used. We extend provisions of the Act of 1903 as to sales of parcels of land to persons who are not tenants. It is most desirable, having regard to the difficult problems that the Congested Districts Board will have before them, to enable them, at their discretion, to give parcels of land for other purposes than in relief of uneconomic holdings. They can only do it now under the severest restrictions, and they must give notice to the Lord-Lieutenant in every case in which they exercise the power. It is most desirable that there should be a policy of friendliness carried on—it is desirable that they should have the power of coming to terms and making a bargain. We also provide for a system of afforestation. I think the hon. Member for East Clare takes a just interest in this question. It is of vital importance first to encourage the planting of trees and, secondly, to prevent their destruction. Then there is the mysterious subject of future tenants. It is not generally known what a future tenant is. I think I can explain it to those who do not know. A "future tenant" is the holder of a yearly tenancy which was created since 1881. A great many present tenants have become future tenants under the operation of the Act of 1887. In that Act there is a clause which is commonly called "the eviction-made-easy clause." I do not think anybody can blame people for putting an interpretation upon that clause which is intelligible to them and which indicates the character of the provision. The eviction-made-easy clause was one by which notice was served on a tenant who was in arrears of rent, and, instead of turning him out and creating a scene by an actual eviction, he was turned into a caretaker, and there he remained, but lost his right of having a fair rent fixed by the Court. He might be restored within six months by a writ of restitution upon payment of the arrears of rent and costs, and in that case he got back the benefit of having a fair rent fixed. When that was not done, the landlord and tenant came to terms; the tenant remained in possession, but lost, as I have said, the right to have a fair rent fixed. We restore that right.

MR. MOORE (Armagh N.): Are these the only future tenants included?

*MR. BIRRELL: Yes, they are the only future tenants to be included.

MR. MOORE: The future tenants of the Act of 1881 are a much larger class.

MR. BIRRELL: Those that I have mentioned are the only persons, I think, to whom the new provision will apply. Now, if you give compulsory powers over one-third of Ireland to the Congested Districts Board for the relief of congestion it will be impossible to withhold similar powers from the Estates Commissioners outside that area. Otherwise the boundary question would constantly arise, and as nobody knows better than the right hon. Member for Dover, there are many estates outside the congested districts which present precisely the same features and difficulties, and to include the one and exclude the other would be, in my judgment, to cause great injustice. Obviously, these powers will have to be exercised within close limits owing to the limitations of the resources of the Estates Commissioners. Yet these powers are as necessary in the one case as in the other to secure that social order for which, and for which alone, you can justify the provisions of the Act of 1903. I am very sorry for having occupied so much of the time of the House in explaining this measure — [Cries of "No, no" and "Go on."]—but, as I have striven in the cause of land purchase—to extend it, to enlarge it, and to continue it—as I have never striven in any cause before, either public or private, either in the interest of wife or child, for either fame or fortune, I have endeavoured to do the best I can in trying circumstances and in an irritated state of the money market—to bring forward proposals which, though they must of necessity bring disappointment to many people, to some as appearing too close and to others because they may seem excessive, I believe are fair, generous and courageous terms, having for their object not to reverse the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, but to continue it and to pursue it. Though long and difficult the path may be by which we have to travel, it is, I believe, a path which, eventually, if we do not lose courage, will lead us to settled peace and increased prosperity in Ireland and these conditions must of necessity redound to the credit and the safety of the United Kingdom.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That leave be given to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the occupation and ownership of land in Ireland, and for other purposes relating thereto."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The right hon. Gentleman has made a very long speech and has been dealing with an old but technical subject, and I am sure I am expressing the view of everyone who has listened to him from all quarters of the House when I say that from first to last his speech has been intensely interesting. It is due to him that someone should immediately rise representing the Irish National Party in this House to express their opinion on that speech. The right hon. Gentleman did not exaggerate the gravity of the problem in his opening remarks. No man sitting upon these benches will dispute his statement that the future welfare and prosperity and peace of Ireland depended upon the rapidity of the progress of land purchase. Speaking on behalf of the Irish Party and expressing their views at their request, what I have to say after listening to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman is this—that whatever defects there may be in this measure—and there are some—and whatever complaints we may have to make of certain portions of it, speaking of this measure as a whole, we recognise it as a bold and a far-reaching measure of reform. We do not expect on these occasions—we have been taught by long and bitter experience not to do so—to find in any measure for Ireland, proceeding from either party in the State, all the suggestions put forward by the Nationalist Party. Some portions of this Bill are not in accord with the views we pressed upon the Government, but taking the measure as a whole, with the few exceptions to which I will allude in a moment, the measure is framed in accordance with popular sentiment in Ireland. There is a commentary which I think I might be forgiven for making when I allude to the fact that almost every one of the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, put forward now as Amendments to the existing law, are simply proposals to carry into effect Amendments of ours and proposals of ou s made again and again for years in this House. This Parliament has been tortured by the Irish land question. You have passed I do not know how many Bills into Acts since at the expense of great trouble and time. You have passed thirty or forty Acts in the past fifty years, and since the Land Act of 1903 there have actually been three Land Acts passed, and if Parliament is tortured and the question comes up again and again like a phantom to haunt this Assembly, what is the reason? The reason is that our proposals have been rejected and put upon one side for those of British representatives and the British Government—they thought they knew better than we, and this measure, brought in as it is as an Amendment to the Act of 1903, if carried into law will simply carry out the proposals and the Amendments which we brought forward in Committee on the Bill of 1903. There are three portions in the right hon. Gentleman's speech, but I will take the last portion first, that which deals with the general amendment of the law of 1903 and the Irish Land Acts generally. The right hon. Gentleman proposes, in the first instance, a general power of compulsion to be vested in the Estates Commissioners outside the congested areas, and I presume the machinery to be provided for the exercise of the powers of compulsion will be the same or similar to the machinery inside the congested area. I have to say that that proposal will be received with wide-spread satisfaction in Ireland. It is a proposal that has been put in the forefront by the National Party for a very long time indeed, and one we have again and again pressed upon succeeding Governments. He proposes also to include that mysterious entity called the "future tenant," to admit him to the benefits of the Act of 1881, and in taking that course also the action of the right hon. Gentleman will be received with the greatest possible satisfaction in Ireland. With reference to the zones. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will tell me if I misunderstood him. I understood him to say he does not intend to abolish the zones, but, as I understood, he proposes to give the Estates Commissioners, in any case falling within the zones, the right if they so choose to make an investigation as to the value of the security on one side and the equity of the price on the other, and if they are not satisfied, they are to have power to refuse the power of sale. If that does not go to the length we asked with regard to the abolition of the zones, it goes a long distance towards it and certainly will give the greatest possible satisfaction, always, of course, on the understanding, as I understand is the right hon. Gentleman's view, that in considering the equity of price, they should consider not only the equity of price in regard to the remainder-men and vendor, but as between the landlord and tenant. I will not dwell further upon this portion of the subject. The proposals he indicates with reference to forestry are fully needed. The whole country has been denuded of trees. All sections of the Irish people will welcome the right hon. Gentleman's proposal. There were other matters which can wait until we see the text of the Bill. I content myself with glancing rapidly at what I regard as the vital proposals regarding the amendment of the law. I have to say that his proposal with reference to the universal right of compulsion, and with reference to future tenants, and his proposal with reference to the zone and in other points I have mentioned, will be received with widespread satisfaction in Ireland. Now let me deal for a few moments with the second portion of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman—the question of congestion. He drew a pathetic picture of the problem of congestion, and indeed no picture that could be drawn could adequately paint the horrors of the present situation in the congested portions of Ireland. One aspect of the problem of congestion was not mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. It is this. What is the origin of the congestion problem? Why is it that you have on one side these congested districts of poor people living on wretched patches of land, on which if they had it for nothing, they could not live decently? Why is it that you have people huddled together on wretched inhospitable soil and great vast expanses of rich land unoccupied? That is one feature in the description which the right hon. Gentleman gave of the problem. The origin of it is this. It is an artificially created state of things. The people were taken by force and iniquity off the rich land and driven on to the poor land; and if you are now engaged in the beneficent and holy work of endeavouring to get those people back again off those wretched patches of land on to land that will enable them to live in decency, you are engaged in undoing as far as you can the evil done by British Governments in the past in Ireland. I congratulate the right hon Gentleman and the Government upon having boldly adopted in the main the recommendations of the Dudley Commission, and on behalf of my colleagues I would like to associate myself and them with what the right hon. Gentleman has said about the Dudley Commission and Lord Dudley. The Commission was originally appointed on the suggestion of the Irish Party, and we have watched its proceedings with the keenest interest. We have all recognised the labour and ability bestowed on the work of the Commission, and I should think there is not a man in Ireland of any party who does not feel under a debt of obligation to Lord Dudley. Lord Dudley went to Ireland as a Unionist statesman, a Unionist Lord-Lieutenant. I presume he would still call himself a Unionist, but at any rate he was not long in Ireland before his experience widened his ideas about popular rights and popular demands, and from the day he landed till he left he showed the keenest sympathy with the Irish people, and the poorest of the Irish people, as did also Lady Dudley. There is no question about it. The whole of the Irish people are grateful, and this Report would be always a monument to his generous dealing with the subject, and to his industry, and I can only trust that the Government will be able to pass this part of their Bill which is founded on that Report. I have not yet of course seen a line of this Bill, and I do not know what are the details by which it is proposed to carry out what is in the speech of the Chief Secretary. But I confess there were some things which I did not like. I did not like the point about the financial control of the new Board. If I understand him the Administrative Committee is to consist entirely of ex-officio and nominated members of the Board.

*MR. BIRRELL: There will be the opportunity to elect one member.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I see. I do not say I am satisfied with that, but it is a great improvement on what I feared was the case, and when we come to discuss the matter we can consider the desirability of giving a representation of more than one elected member. The Report of the Dudley Commission asked I think, £300,000 a year. The Government are only providing £250,000. I cannot complain of that under the circumstances. I would have been glad to see the recommendation of the Report carried out in full, but I admit that raising it from £86,000 to £250,000 is, taking all the circumstances into account, not an ungenerous dealing with this question. We have many quarrels with the Treasury. We carry on a constant quarrel with them, and I do not think the fault has ever been upon our side, but I am bound to say that when we find them coming any appreciable distance towards a generous treatment of these questions, we are always willing to acknowledge it, and just as in the case of the Labourers Bill when the right hon. Gentleman (the Prime Minister) was at the Treasury it dealt not unfairly with us, so now I say that the new Chancellor of the Exchequer has dealt not unfairly with us. There is another small matter. The Chief Secretary proposes having one paid member of the Board. The Dudley Commission proposed three, and I think the general view upon this subject is that there should be more than one. Speaking, therefore, on the congested districts proposals generally, I say they meet with satisfaction and approval on these benches, and that they will meet with great approval and satisfaction in Ireland. I believe these proposals afford the first real hope of the settlement of this question, and taken in connection with the general powers of compulsion which the Commissioners will have over the rest of Ireland (the congested problem is not confined to the counties named) in my opinion they offer a reasonable hope that in the near future this whole question may be successfully dealt with. I am most anxious not to delay the House unnecessarily, and I pass on to the first portion of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He treated a difficult subject, especially for those Members who have not followed the course of the finance of the Land Act of 1903, for the last five years. Some time ago the Treasury formed a Committee and they issued a Report and immediately afterwards the Irish Party formed a Committee which issued a contrary Report. I am bound to acknowledge that although on the question of the finance of the Act the Government have not gone to the full length we asked or anything like it, in some particulars, they have advanced considerably since the issue of the Report of the Treasury Committee. They have advanced along the lines pointed out by the Irish Party. The Treasury Committee presided over by the present President of the Board of Education did not suggest for a moment that the loss on flotation should be taken over by the Treasury. On the contrary, the whole of that Committee Report was devoted to endeavouring to devise some means of lightening the load on the ratepayers, without putting anything on the Treasury. The Irish Party brushed that to one side, and put forward boldly the demand that this loss should fall upon the Treasury. This scheme in 1903 was constantly spoken of as a great Imperial policy. It would have been an absurdity indeed if a great Imperial policy were to be carried out at the expense of the poor ratepayers of Ireland. We demanded therefore that the whole of the cost of flotation and incidental expenses amounting as it will do finally to a sum of over £500,000 for a considerable number of years should be undertaken by the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman has boldly grappled with that point and has taken the liability wholly off the ratepayers of Ireland. I admit in the frankest way that that is a very important and far-reaching decision of his, and that it will be received with the greatest possible satisfaction in Ireland.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): What about England?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Of course, you speak for England. No measure of this kind can be carried without full discussion, and when that discussion comes, of course the one person everybody will be eager to hear representing England will be the hon. Baronet. Now, the general complaint I make with reference to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman is this—it does not provide for a sufficiently rapid rate of carrying on land purchase in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman suggests £5,000,000 a year cash and £5,000,000 in addition of 2¾ per cent. stock to be accepted in lieu of cash by the landlords. The right hon. Gentleman contemplates progress at the rate of £10,000,000 a year. I admit that is about double what the progress has been, but still it is not rapid enough. The right hon. Gentleman talks of the money market and says he cannot get more than £5,000,000 a year without considerable loss. He says British credit must be reserved for some national emergency. Is not this a national emergency? It is an emergency that has arisen in the carrying out of a great national policy, adopted by Parliament, sanctioned by both parties in this House, and on which depends the future success, prosperity and peace of Ireland. You say a national emergency would be if you had to inaugurate a war against 200,000 or 300,000 Dutchmen in South Africa or elsewhere. Your credit is to be reserved for that. But is it not a national emergency to carry out a great Imperial policy of peace, to preserve men's lives instead of destroying them, and to spread prosperity and peace amongst the people? I am bound to say that I think the Treasury in this matter ought to have gone further than they have done. I am not satisfied with the limit of £5,000,000 a year cash and £10,000,000 to the working power of the Land Commission. That brings me to the second excuse of the right hon. Gentleman. He said it was not only that he could not get the money, but that if he had it he could not put the transactions through more quickly. Well, I cannot believe that. I know that as the office works at present, and I say nothing against the conditions there, the output of £5,000,000 a year is as much as they can do, but I cannot conceive that it is impossible for you by a reconstruction of your procedure and an increase of your staff to enable far more than £10,000,000 a year to go through. It is not a Treasury objection, for if you increase the staff you shorten the period for the Land Commission to have work to do. This is only a temporary transaction, and if you let it go on for twenty-five years the Treasury is not gaining. You are merely continuing the process, and it is to the interest of the Treasury to make this quicker. I cannot conceive that by simplifying your procedure and increasing your officers it is impossible to put forward more than £10,000,000 a year.

*MR. BIRRELL: I did not say that it was impossible. I said we would do the best that we could, but my own belief honestly is that we shall not get through more than £10,000,000 a year.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I was dealing with the fact that the right hon. Gentleman said that his experience was that they would never be able to do so, but I am glad to have got that qualification, as I am convinced that where there is a will there is a way. It is of the most urgent national importance that this thing should not drag along. It is important from the point of view of England, as well as Ireland, that no effort should be spared to get these transactions through as quickly as possible. I say, therefore, that the progress as sketched by the right hon. Gentleman is too slow. Now the right hon. Gentleman proposed that in future there shall be created a 3 per cent. stock, instead of a 2¾ per cent., and that the landlords shall be paid, not by any option of theirs but on the option of the Treasury, in stock or money. If the 3 per cent. stock went up to a premium the Treasury would pay the money and collar the premium; if the stock falls below par they would pay in stock. The objection I have to that is that it raises the interest for the tenant purchaser from 2¾ per cent. to 3 per cent. It is all very well to say that the tenant, if he makes a good bargain with his landlord, and buys at a low price, will get over that with no loss, but I do not want to see any additional obstacle put in the way of agreement between landlord and tenant. I do not want to see the process made slower. I am sure this will have that effect, therefore I feel that it will be the duty of my colleagues and myself, when we come to that portion of the subject, to move Amendments and to do what we can to re-cast that portion. On the question of the bonus I do not agree with the Chief Secretary—the right hon. Member for Dover will speak directly and enlighten us on this point—I do not agree with the Chief Secretary that whereas the £100,000,000 for land purchased was a calculation, the £12,000,000 bonus was a limit. What we distinctly understood at the time was that £12,000,000 was the amount of the bonus, because £12,000,000 would give 12 per cent. on £100,000,000. I remember distinctly in this House Mr. John Morley, as he then was, sitting on the Front Opposition Bench, saying that in regard to the figure of £12,000,000—

> "You are making a mistake; your £12,000,000 will not be enough, because you are under-estimating the value of the land in Ireland. £12,000,000 will not give you 12 per cent. on your money."

And he said that £22,000,000, in his opinion, would be required. How was that met? No one met it by saying: "Oh, £12,000,000 is the limit." The estimate of £100,000,000 was accepted, and no one pursued the matter further. Now you find your £12,000,000 is not enough to carry out that part of what I regard as the bargain. You are going to say that all the landlords who lodged agreements before November 1st are to get the 12 per cent. bonus in full, but that if this Bill does not pass no landlord who comes after November 1st can get more than 3 per cent. bonus, and even if this Bill does pass, although there is to be a large addition to the £12,000,000, still I gather no landlord can be certain that he will get as much as 12 per cent. I protest against that. You may ask why I should intervene, and say that this is primarily a landlord's question. I deny that. I say that inasmuch as it interferes with smooth and rapid progress it is not merely a landlord's affair, but is a tenant's affair as well. But even if it were only a landlord's affair, I would take the same line. I expect the Irish landlords to facilitate us in other portions of this Bill, which are favourable to the tenants. The demand was made by an hon. friend of mine above the gangway that the Government should introduce two Bills, the one dealing with finance, and the other with general amendments of the law. We were not quite such children as to agree to anything of the kind. Here we get the whole of these different portions hanging together. If we are to assist the landlord to get the 12 per cent. bonus upon new transactions, then it must be on the condition that it is part of the general Bill, and that they will facilitate us in getting those other portions which are favourable to tenants. I understand that the matter of the bonus stands in their way. Without new legislation the Government cannot give one additional penny of bonus to the £12,000,000, and therefore there will be less than £3,000,000 of bonus left to deal with the £80,000,000 of new transactions. As I understand, the bonus will be dealt with in accordance with a graduated scale. Some of the landlords who sell their estates cheap will get 16 per cent. instead of 12 per cent., and then it will be graduated up to a point at which every sensible man would say the bonus will disappear altogether. Of course, until we see that scale, and carefully examine it, and make careful calculations as to the probable price to be paid, it is impossible to estimate how much more than the £12,000,000 will be required by the Treasury. But this I will take as certain, if this Bill passes and a scale of that kind is put in, a large sum running into millions must be provided by the Treasury to eke out the balance of the £12,000,000. I am not entirely satisfied with that. We are all in favour of graduation. We first proposed it in Committee on the Land Act of 1903 in this House. We have proposed it over and over again. Therefore we are certainly in favour of graduation, but, if I could, I would get an additional sum in bonuses which in its amount would represent 12 per cent. on the whole of the new transaction. If the landlords will work with us on the other portions of the Bill, I am willing to work with them on that portion of the Bill, and to do the very best I can to see it carried out. For the present, therefore, I leave it as it stands, until we see the Bill and make calculations, and can consider it more closely. This Bill is not wholly satisfactory. I have pointed to some provisions in which I consider it eminently unsatisfactory, but no measure for Ireland ever proposed in this House was entirely satisfactory. Some defects are of an exceedingly great character, but I repeat what I said at the commencement that, viewing this measure as a whole, it is a great, a bold, and a far-reaching measure. What is to be the fate of the Bill? I would ask from the Government that they fix an early date for the Second Reading, so that after seeing the text of the Bill we may be in a position to enter upon intelligent discussion on all its details. I recognise, understanding the Parliamentary situation as I do, that the immediate fate of this measure depends upon circumstances over which the Chief Secretary probably has no control, and over which certainly we on these benches have no control. I am a careful student of the journalistic prophets in relation to Paliamentary affairs, and I have noticed with interest that quite recently suggestions have been made in more than one quarter. I do not know whether there is any authority for any of them. One suggestion was that if the Licensing Bill is not rejected on Second Reading but goes into Committee, and if the English Education Bill is allowed considerable discussion, which I think is extremely likely in that House, the Government have already practically made up their mind that they can not prorogue Parliament before Christmas, and that they will have to adjourn over Christmas and continue the session if necessary till the month of March. I claim if that programme were carried out we should be entitled before Parliament prorogued this session to have this Irish Bill pushed through all its stages in this House. Another suggestion was that the Government might take the course of proroguing before Christmas, and pass a Resolution hanging up the Licensing Bill or the Education Bill, so that they might proceed immediately next session at the place where they had left off. If that alternative is adopted by the Government, and any Bill is hung up, I claim that the Irish Bill should be hung up, so that we may be enabled to proceed with it at the commencement of next year. I ask the Government to make it quite clear as to their intentions. There are those who will say that this Bill is a mere sham and is not intended to be seriously proceeded with. I ask the Government to take action, and show that any such statement is not true. So far as the Chief Secretary is concerned I know perfectly well it is not true. No man who has tried to govern Ireland from Dublin Castle under any conditions—under the conditions of the peace and order of to-day—no man with that responsibility on his shoulders will take upon himself the risk of making a sham and a phantom proposal. He knows the gravity of the situation in Ireland perfectly well. He knows that the unrest and danger of disturbance in Ireland are entirely due to the delay in introducing the Bill. I am not blaming him for the delay. It was due almost entirely to the work of the Dudley Commission. That Commission sat far longer than anybody thought they would sit. If it got abroad in Ireland now after the Bill has been introduced and is on the whole of a friendly and satisfactory character, that it is intended as a sham and that the Government have no intention of passing it into law, I say as I said outside the House that the right hon. Gentleman would find the Government of Ireland impossible, and I would look forward to the future of Ireland with great apprehension and fear. I ask the Chief Secretary to allow this Bill to be proceeded with at once. I hope all parties in Ireland will seriously consider their responsibilities and will make concessions on all sides. If they do that, this Bill will lead to a successful bit of legislation. If the Chief Secretary carries this Bill into law, it will be more valuable to him as Governor of Ireland than all the Coercion Acts and policemen that were ever at the disposal of the Chief Secretary.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I have listened to two speeches on a subject of perennial interest. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford's concluding observations seemed to me to be at variance with the statement he made a little earlier. He then said that a question of this kind demands the fullest discussion. That is so. Anyone who has listened to the speech of the Chief Secretary and of the hon. and learned Member must see that this is not a mere amending Act; it is a new Act in respect both of the whole finance on which the Act of 1903 is founded, and in respect of the whole administrative manner in which the operations under that Act are to be carried out. May I remind the House of the deliberation with which we proceeded in 1903? Before the Act of 1903 there was, in 1902, a trial Bill. The scope of the Act of 1903 was discussed on the Motion for the Address early in the year. The First Reading was taken in March. The Second Reading was postponed until after the Easter holidays, in order that all classes in Ireland might have an opportunity of studying its provisions. I content myself, on this aspect of the subject, by saying that I do not believe it possible, and if it were possible, it would not be right, for any Government to try to drive such a measure as this through, jostling between the chariots of the Licensing Bill and of the Education Bill. Therefore, from what I have said, I dismiss as possible or probable, that we have, now or within a few weeks, to come to a decision upon the very complicated measure which the Chief Secretary has introduced. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford, in the first part of his speech, dealt with the administrative portion of the Bill, but towards the end of his remarks he had to come round to its financial proposals; and in my opinion it will be found that the whole of this measure, whether we agree with it or whether we do not, will depend entirely upon its financial provisions. You may put in it as many promises as you please, or you may put in provisions which some of us may think injurious, it does not matter one way or the other, if the financial provisions are so drawn up as to make it impossible for you to proceed in the direction you desire to follow. The hon. and learned Member towards the end of his speech thanked the Government effusively for taking the loss of flotation off the Irish ratepayers and placing it upon the British Treasury. But have they done so? After they have dealt with the applications already received, the tenant, I gather, is to pay a higher interest for his money as soon as we get this legislation, and the landlord is to take the 3 per cent. stock at its face value. If that be so, then there will not be any loss on the Treasury. The whole of what is now borne by the Irish Development Grant will then be borne by the parties to the bargain. That is not very generous.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): It is £14,000,000 on £53,000,000.

*MR. WYNDHAM: I wish to be careful in my argument on this point. It is not generous—though, perhaps, it is not a case of generosity—to say, in respect of future transactions, that the loss shall be borne entirely by the landlords and tenants. It is not denied that this will be the effect of the future provisions. So far as the future is concerned, therefore, in respect of every single application which has come in since 1st November, or which may come in hereafter, the whole of what was given under the solemn compact of the Act of 1903 has gone. It is all withdrawn. That is not denied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I come to the other financial provision in regard to the bonus. If the Government think that a graduated scale will result, as they expect it will, they are very much mistaken. The Leader of the Nationalist Party in his speech made overtures across the gangway to hon. friends behind me, as representing Irish constituencies, asking landlords and tenants to work together, in order to get the best results they could in the interests of both. It would not be beyond the wit of the Irish landlord or the Irish tenant to find the exact point in the graduation which would enable them to get the most out of the Treasury and the least out of their own pockets. Whatever you do in respect of the loss on flotation, and in respect of the bonus, affects the landlord and tenant equally. If the terms offered make the bargain easy then it is almost tautology to say it makes it easy to come to a deal. If you make it harder to come to a deal, then there must be more give and take on both sides. If you make it easy to come to a deal, then there is more taken by both sides out of the British Treasury. That is the elementary proposition which underlies the whole of this matter of Irish land purchase. If you can give good terms both landlords and tenants come together, and if you cannot—and that may be the case—both landlords and tenants suffer when trying to come to terms. If there is any substance in what I have said—and I think there is—the size of this problem is a very important matter. Our views, based upon how much the British taxpayer may be asked to bear, and whether it is proper to continue the present bonus, must be modified to a certain extent by the size of this problem. The speech of the Chief Secretary, so far as finance was concerned, was made up of two parts, one was a criticism of the Act of 1903, and the other dealt with the finance of the Bill he is introducing. I should not take up the time of the House with a mere barren defence of speculative estimates made up five years ago, unless the size of the problem had a very important and decisive bearing upon the other part of the Chief Secretary's speech, namely, his financial proposals. If he is wrong in believing the problem to be one of £180,000,000, we may say he has no right to depart from a solemn bargain entered into five years ago. The size of the problem may depend upon two things. It may depend upon much higher prices having been given than were anticipated when we brought in the Act of 1903, or upon the actual amount of work that has to be done. The Chief Secretary touched upon both. He seemed to suggest that far higher prices have been given than were contemplated by the Act of 1903. I cannot conceive how any hon. Member sitting for an Irish constituency can say that, in so far as second-term tenants are concerned, higher prices have been given than were contemplated when they supported that Act. It may be the prices are too high—I never expressed an opinion as to the prices—but what I say is that the prices realised are almost surprisingly in accordance with the views expressed at the Conference and in the House of Commons. Under the Conference terms the tenants were to get a reduction of from 15 to 25 per cent. The average is 20 per cent. The operation of that Act as revealed in the analysed and classified results has been that in 95 per cent. of the second-term rents the average reduction has been 19·7 per cent., which is within ·3 of the average the Conferance recommended, and which hon. Members from Ireland thought reasonable at the time. It may be too high, and it may be too low, but it does not vary from what we anticipated to be the meaning of hon. Members who spoke for Ireland at the time. Indeed, when they said that the landlord—to take his part of the case—was to have 90 per cent. of his income on a second-term rent basis, whilst investing his money at 3 per cent., they were offering him thirty years purchase. But under the measure which we introduced it seemed probable that the landlord would have to invest at least at 3¼ per cent., and then he would only get about £90 for every £100. If you take the average of the tenant's reduction, *i.e.* 19·7, you will find that the landlord gets 89·3 of his income from second-term rents, including the bonus. So the tenant has got within ·3 of what was anticipated, and the landlord, so far as second-term rents are concerned, has an income within ·7 of the Conference terms. It may have been foolish to embody such terms in the Bill. I do not think it was. I think it was wise. Unless we offered generous terms to landlord and tenant, purchase would not have become what it now is, the acknowledged rule for solving the land problem in Ireland. When we were bringing in the Act of 1903 there were still many representatives of landlords and tenants who said they did not believe in purchase. There were many landlords who said they would not sell. That is all over. The policy stands, and, as the Chief Secretary says, it would be politically and economically a blunder of the greatest magnitude to arrest the progress of purchase in Ireland. The inflation of the sum estimated is not, therefore, due, in my opinion, for the reasons I have given, to prices having been far higher than was contemplated at the time, nor is the problem itself much larger than was anticipated at the time. I do not know how the Chief Secretary has arrived at the total of £180,000,000. It is a subject which, though speculative, can be considered along certain lines of thought which seem to point to certain probable conclusions. If you take the Census of Ireland, there are 490,000 agricultural holdings. That includes 19,000,000 out of 21,000,000 acres in Ireland. That includes every single holding separately assessed, land attached to labourers' cottages, waste land, and tracts of grass land. We must, I suppose, deduct the 80,000 people who have bought already. That leaves us 410,000. Then we have 159,000 applications. How have the Government arrived at their enormous total? I do not know how they have done it. It looks to me as if they have done it by a simple rule of three sum. They say: "Here are 159,000 applications, which come to so much. If we take the balance, with the exception of the 80,000 already dealt with, the sums involved will be about the same relatively." I have done it in that way, and have got very nearly to the Government figure, but not quite; I could not get up to £180,000,000, but I got up to £160,000,000. If they have done it by some such simple and elementary process, I venture to suggest that they have left two important considerations altogether out of account. There are other deductions to be made in respect of holdings which will not be sold, and we must consider whether the holdings which have still to be sold are as likely to be of as valuable a character as the holdings of which sales have already been accomplished. I invite the House for a moment to give me their attention upon these two points, because if I am right in the view I take upon these two points, then this £180,000,000 is a fabulous total, and the financial proposals of the Government would have to be justified and examined upon their merits, and not under the necessity of facing the financial burdens which, the Chief Secretary says, the British tax payer ought not to shoulder. Take the deductions which, in my opinion, ought to be made upon the possible total of holdings that can be bought or sold. These 490,000 holdings must include a great proportion of the waste land in Ireland. You must deduct something for waste land, which is taken one year for a sheep run and not another. Then you have to deduct every single plot attached to a labourer's cottage, which has been created by a rural district council. You have to deduct market gardens, town plots and accommodation plots, of which there are many right into the towns—town parks. Under that head it is quite clear that if 490,000 is the total number of all the holdings considerable deductions must be made for holdings which are not mainly agricultural and which will not be sold. Then when you come to the question of grass farms there are 11,500,000 acres under grass held sometimes in large quantities by one man. I have known a case of one man who occupied sixteen grass farms. It is perfectly clear if we are going to consider the operations under the Act of 1903 and not going into new operations of a totally different character, very great deductions must be made under that head also from the possible total which you get if you deduct the 80,000 holdings sold from the maximum of 490,000 holdings which covers the whole of agricultural Ireland and a great deal of the waste land of Ireland into the bargain. It may be that in the minds of the Government their new proposals dispose of that point, and that they are going to buy all the grass in Ireland. I do not think they are. I do not think even their proposals make any approach towards what I once called a form of economic insanity. I called the idea of breaking up the grass ranches a form of economic insanity in 1903. No one told me I was wrong then. I said we must deduct a great deal for those which, in my opinion, will never be sold. Nobody dissented. This is not a question of relieving congestion. That is another matter. The relief of congestion, as we understood it and provided for it in 1903, perhaps inadequately, is concerned with improving the holding of a man who is now a tenant. Hitherto, with very unimportant exceptions, we have contemplated two things, the abolition of dual ownership in Ireland, that is to say, allowing the occupying tenant to buy his holding as it is; and, as an addition to that, in the case of the congested district, and of congestion wherever it may be found, our second object was improving the holding of a tenant before the estate passes for sale. By all means let us discuss whether the policy of the relief of congestion should or should not be carried out more vigorously. That will not touch my deduction under the third head. Carry it out, if it be wise, in accordance with the maximum recommendation of the Dudley Report, and still, from the point of view of finance, you will not be dealing with many of the great grass farms which could not be used for the improvement of the farms of these people. If that be so, how much may you deduct from this total? I think you might deduct 20 per cent. I think 15 per cent. is a very restricted estimate. But on that restricted estimate you must deduct, in round numbers, some 75,000 in respect of holdings that will not be sold, in addition to the 80,000 that have been sold, and the 157,000 in respect of which applications have been received, that would leave 176,000 applications which may still be expected. If that is the case, how much are the 176,000 holdings which have to be dealt with going to cost on an average? Here we come to the second point. I think the Government have ignored another important consideration. They seem to have supposed that the holdings in respect to which they had applications cost no more than the holdings with which they will have to deal. We assumed that, in selling land as in selling oranges, the best would go first. It is far easier to sell a good farm. When the tenant gets a good article he feels secure against any chance in the future, and the landlord gets a good round sum. It is when you come to farms of low value that it is hard to come to terms, and if you have been dealing with the dearer article, and the applications that come are of the cheaper, you will find that your rule of three sum is not the way by which to arrive at the money size of this problem. I am not talking of the number of years purchase. My point is the differences between, say, a holding of £50 value and one of £10. If it can be shown that you have been dealing with a greater proportion of holdings with a £50 value in the past than remain to be dealt with in the future I venture to submit that your position is different. Can that be shown ? I think it can. Out of 29,000 applications received last year, only 2,000 came from Connaught. Applications have come in greater numbers from the provinces of Leinster and Munster, where the article is dear, than from Connaught, where the article is cheap. Then let us get some comparison from these values if we can. I think I can. In Leinster the average rental of all holdings for which there have been applications is £23 8s. ; in Munster it is £21 2s. ; in Ulster, £10 2s. 6d. ; and in Connaught, £9 12s. 9d., with the inevitable result that the average amount of the advance for all the applications from Leinster has been £528 ; from Munster, £452 ; from Ulster, £242 ; and from Connaught, £211. That has nothing to do with years purchase. It means that in Connaught you have the cheaper article. In Leinster, Munster, and Ulster, you had applications in respect of one-third of all the holdings, and in Connaught you had only applications in respect of one-eighth. Is it not evident that when Connaught catches up the average amount of advances will tend far more towards the £211 average of Connaught, and away from the £528 average in respect of Leinster ? All the figures show that the best article went first. If we take the earliest applications for the whole of Ireland, namely, those in respect of which advances have already been made, it will be seen that the average was £394 for each application. Taking the average for the whole period, it was £350 ; last year it was £330. There has been a drop in the average of the total applications of £64 in the course of the first four years of the operation of the Act. Is it rash to say that the drop of £64 will happen again in the course of the twelve or twenty years that remain ? I think it is sure to be repeated. But supposing it is not. If three out of twenty farms were not to be sold because of reductions, and if you agree with me in thinking that that drop will be repeated to the extent of 50 per cent. then the size of this problem is not £180,000,000 but £108,000,000. If you think it is more reasonable to believe that the average fall of £64 will be repeated in full then the total would be £102,000,000, which is not very far off the estimate made in 1903. So far I have confined myself to the kind of operations which were contemplated when the Act of 1903 was introduced. I hold that any enlargement of the policy of the Act of 1903 must be judged on its merits, and ought not to be paid for at the expense of people who are satisfied with the Act of 1903 ; if it is right to deal more vigorously with congestion than before. But do not tell us that because you are going to do this in some parts of Ireland you are going to go back on the bargain ratified in this House in respect of tenants throughout the whole of Ireland. I come, therefore, to the question of the enlargement of policy ; and, confining myself to finance, must estimate what additions should be made to the total estimate in respect of such enlargement. You take into your area of scheduled congestion the whole of Connaught and the counties of Clare, Donegal, Kerry and some parts of Cork. That may be right or wrong on its merits. But this extension of the area of congestion does not justify you in going back upon the bargain solemnly ratified by every party in Ireland on behalf of the landlord and tenant. Then I come to the enlargement of the holdings Here again I am in some doubt. In one part of his speech the Chief Secretary said that in Ireland there are no other parties except the landlord and the occupier, and I understood from an earlier portion of his remarks in dealing with congestion that he did not mean to enlarge those classes, but meant to improve the very bad uneconomic holdings and increase the income of the Board for that purpose. From the financial point of view I did not understand that he intended to give any attention whatever to the separate policy of creating a new class of proprietors in Ireland who have never been tenants. The two policies are quite distinct. The right hon. Gentleman caused some doubt in my mind, later on, when he said that in the Act of 1903, for which I was responsible, we had broken away from that tradition, and had started the policy of using State credit in order to create new holdings to be bought by those who occupied them. Now the only foundation for that is Section 2 of the Act which says that under very limited restrictions and in the case of each estate as it is sold—this has nothing to do with roaming all over Ireland—you may sell parcels to four classes. You may sell to a tenant or proprietor in the neighbourhood owning or occupying a holding of the valuation of £5; and to the occupier of a holding on the estate. These are already owners or occupiers. The only two cases in which we have brought a new man in, are the case of the evicted tenant and the case of the sons of the tenant on the estate. The son of a tenant on the estate and the proprietor of a neighbouring holding were to be sold parcels out of any spare untenanted land over and above what was needed to improve congested holdings on the estate. If there were 600 acres of grass land, 400 acres might very properly be used for improving the residues round the estate and the balance of 200 acres could be used under strict limitations for this strictly limited purpose of providing land for evicted tenants and the sons of farmers. That is all that is in the Act of 1903 to which the right hon. Gentleman can point as justification for confusing two classes of cases which, in my opinion, ought to be kept sharply divided the one from the other. I am sure we shall be prepared to study the provision in this Bill for dealing with congestion. I do not propose to criticise that portion of the Bill at the present moment, but I may say that it does not commend itself altogether to my judgment. We do not say that the new Board should not have £250,000 if we can be persuaded that it can properly administer that amount. We shall, however, carefully examine the proposals of the Government. I have my doubts in regard to many of the proposals put forward, but I have given my views in evidence before the Dudley Commission. I do not believe that compulsion is the best plan, but if you take the maximum recommendation of the Dudley Commission, taking the new area they propose, which includes the whole of Connaught, Donegal, Kerry, Clare and part of Cork; if in that area you deal as they propose to deal with congestion in what I must call a heroic and somewhat pedantic way—out of 180,000 holdings it is proposed to treat 80,000 on this basis, the valuation being £350,000—then you are going to buy land worth £450,000 to mend the economic defects of these 80,000 holdings. That may be right or wrong, but I call it heroic to buy land in that way. I know there is some congestion outside, but it is only sporadic, and if you go in for the maximum proposal of the Dudley Commission you will do all that can be expected in respect of congestion and perhaps more, because they recommend improving holdings which have already been bought to the satisfaction of the present holders. If you take their maximum proposal to buy this land you cannot be adding more than £10,000,000 to the financial size of the problem, which I ventured to sketch in the first part of my remarks. Up to the present I have been confining myself to finance. I do not propose until I have read the measure of the Government to criticise the provisions for dealing with congestion. I am sure I shall have to criticise them, but looking at the financial side of the problem, taking the highest estimate of £108,000,000 instead of £102,000,000, and adding the extravagant sum of £10,000,000 for heroic treatment you cannot inflate the size of this problem to more than £120,000,000. It cannot be done upon any reasonable examination based upon the probabilities of the case. If that is so, the prospective burden on the taxpayers do not justify the right hon. Gentleman in pleading necessity which has no law for going back upon the bargains arrived at five years ago. The total additional charge for bonus and losses on flotation on an additional £20,000,000—if you take the average at which stock can be floated over the whole period to be, more probably, 90 than 88—will be £150,222. If you put the whole additional charge which would be involved by dealing with congestion up to the maximum recommendations and accept the size of the problem which I have indicated, this is a matter not of £1,000,000 a year, but of a sum between £350,000 and £360,000 per annum at the outside beyond the £390,000 allocated to the bonus of the £160,000 hypothecated to losses on flotation, when the Act of 1903 was introduced. I put my calculation before the House, and I think it is necessary, whatever views we may form, that we should penetrate a little more deeply into this problem and see whether my £120,000,000 at the outside is not nearer to the probabilities of the case than the Chief Secretary's £180,000,000. When we come to the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman with respect to the bonus I prefer to study his sliding scale before pronouncing definitely upon it. I see more reasons than the Chief Secretary was disposed to allow in favour of the bonus as it stands in the present Act. I began with a sliding scale, and my Bill, when introduced had a sliding scale in it, but the discussion in Committee revealed that you could not get any two sections of opinion to agree upon the kind of sliding scale which ought to be adopted, and ultimately, in despair of arriving at any conclusion, the representatives of landlords, tenants and taxpayers said: "We had better make it an even percentage all round," and I think they were right, because nobody can possibly know the position of the parties to the bargain. If a landlord is in a tight place his tenant finds it out by getting a better bargain than he expected; if the landlord is not anxious to sell at all that enters into the calculation. So that the price arrived at is probably in an imperfect world the nearest index to their respective interests, and so we are taking upon ourselves the function of Providence if we try to alter their conclusions by putting in a bonus on a sliding scale. We hold that so far as the bonus is concerned the Chief Secretary has not made out an argument based upon the sheer necessity of facts in favour of altering the spirit of the terms offered in the year 1903. Turning now to losses on flotation, when the Chief Secretary said in future we are going to take this loss on flotation upon ourselves I felt I had no more to say. But that is not the result of the financial proposals which the Government have put before us. In considering this matter of loss on flotation we have to bear in mind not only the Act of 1903, but also the Irish Development Act passed in the same year, and I think we must cast a glance at the origin as well as at the provisions of that Act. That measure was an equivalent grant to Ireland, consisting of £185,000 a year. It was given because in the year before the Education Act dealing with primary education in England placed £1,400,000 upon the Votes of this House, and it was said that £185,000 was an equivalent grant for Ireland and a little over £200,000 was granted to Scotland. What has happened? I do not pretend to speak with exact information upon this point, and it is not easy to get an exact comparison. Such study as I have been able to give to the Statistical Abstract leads me to believe that the English grant has doubled and the Scottish grant trebled since the Irish Development Grant Act was passed. I may be told that I am to blame for that by making the grant to Ireland statutory, but if I had not done that Ireland would have got nothing at all. If we are to consider, as the Chief Secretary says we must, the political and economic folly of arresting purchase in Ireland surely we need not stop for £250,000 or £350,000 when larger grants have been made to both England and Scotland. We may be blamed because we did not contemplate the exhaustion of the Irish Development Grant. The sum of £185,000 was estimated upon the chance that Consols would not always be depressed. When the finance of the Land Act of 1903 was considered Consols stood at 92⅞, and they had been higher that year, and it was thought that it was not at all unreasonable to suppose that they might go higher still. It was, however, impossible to lay down finance of this character to last fifty years, and that being so is it not more essential to abide by a bargain in its spirit, to which all parties have given their willing consent? If it had been possible, as at one time it seemed possible, to introduce some large reform for primary education in Ireland, then the whole of that grant would have been spent in two or three years, and we should have been confronted then with the difficulty which confronts us now because of the persistent depression of Consols. If that had occurred it would hardly have been contended that purchase must stop or proceed, if at all, by altering the terms solemnly offered to Ireland by the consent of all parties in the House. I think three observations may be added on this matter. The Chief Secretary says quite truly that when all the development grant under the Act of 1903 is exhausted this loss falls on the ratepayers. It was the intention of the authors of the Act that £50,000 a year should be conveyed out of this very grant in each of the first four years in order to assist the Treasury with a working nucleus for managing the finances of the Act. It turned out that the Act did not carry out the intentions of the authors. We, therefore, introduced a measure in 1904 and passed it in 1905 in order that the intentions of the authors of the Act might be carried out in that respect. But it was equally the intention of the authors of the Act that the loss due to flotation should not fall on the Irish landlord, tenant, or ratepayer. It is equally right to carry out the intention of the authors of the Act in that particular too. I think the Government ought to meet this matter with something more than the proposals laid before us. After all, they are in part responsible. They insisted on piling the finances of their Labourers Act on the financial foundations of the Land Act, a course which I was advised was most imprudent, and now they say that the foundations are not strong enough to support the original edifice. By publishing the Report of the Committee presided over by the present President of the Board of Education they put a time-limit for Irish landlords and tenants which has driven them into the offices of the Estates Commissioners, so that I think in the half year to April there were 10,000 applications, in the next five months 22,000 applications, and the Chief Secretary tells us that in the last two days there were applications for £5,000,000. In view of the magnitude of this block I think the Government as parties to the difficulty will have to make a somewhat more heroic effort to get out of the difficulty than I was able to discover in the speech to which we have listened. This is not such a large matter as the Chief Secretary supposes. The Government was prepared only the other day to find £600,000 a year for an object which commends itself to no portion of the Irish people. Is it fantastic to suggest that they might find £350,000 a year for an object which commends itself to all sections of Irish opinion? The contrast is the more striking if we reflect that that £600,000 would have come on the Votes immediately, and expanded to far larger proportions; whilst the smaller sum necessary to carry losses on flotation would come on the Votes gradually in the course of twelve or twenty years, and ultimately disappear altogether. The proposals which the Chief Secretary has made do not observe the spirit of the bargain to which their predecessors were parties no less than we who sit upon this bench. We hold that it is not our business to propose any solution for this difficulty, but we do hold that any solution of the difficulty ought to fulfil at least two conditions. In the first place it ought not to depart from the spirit of the terms of the Act of 1903; any expedient you may offer to those buyers and sellers whose applications are blocked ought to observe the spirit of the Act of 1903. The second condition which we think ought to be observed in any attempt to solve the difficulty—we do not deny the difficulty—is that the solution must not prejudice the interests of future buyers and sellers when the immediate block has been removed. The proposals of the Government do not fulfil either of these conditions. For the immediate block they offer no immediate relief. Their plan hardly expedites purchase. They are going to advance £5,000,000 in cash, which I understand from the Chancellor of the Exchequer can be done in any case. There is no difficulty there, because that is what is going on now, and, therefore, the only thing they do is to say that they will issue £5,000,000 of the present stock and give it to the landlords at the minimum face value of 92. Is that observing the spirit of the bargain of 1903 in dealing with the immediate block? This is really not a question of landlords alone. You cannot offer to the landlord who at this moment is in negotiation with his tenant upon a certain theory, terms that differ widely from that theory, without opening negotiations *ab initio.* If a man expects to get £20,000 and a bonus of 12 per cent., and you offer him instead £20,000 of stock at 92 it is perfectly clear that it is not the bargain which he was prepared to conclude—it is another one, and you do not observe the spirit of the contract of 1903. When you come to your future arrangements, it cannot be said that they will not prejudice the interest of all future buyers and sellers. They will do more than that, they will stop land purchase in Ireland. I understand that for the first time since 1891, the tenant is to be asked to pay 3½ per cent., of which 3 per cent. will be for interest. Under the Acts of 1891, 1896 and 1903, he has only to pay 2¾ per cent. for interest; of course, that handicaps the general plan of purchase. May I ask the House to look at this also from the point of view of the taxpayer, the Treasury and money market. Most Irish estates are mortgaged, some are mortgaged very heavily. I suppose if you take the whole of the land with which we have to deal in this matter, it is mortgaged up to nearly half the value, certainly to 30 per cent. of the value. What will be the effect of paying in stock those who have to meet their mortgages next day? A third or a half of the stock will be thrown on the market and the price driven down. This 3 per cent. will be like the local loan stock. You will have started another stock which will be driven down to compete with your existing Government securities. If half of the stock is thrown on the market on the morrow after it is issued, I do not know where it will go to and we shall be back where we were fifteen years ago. That will not, in the opinion of those who are competent to form a judgment upon this matter, be the best way of dealing with the financial aspect of the problem.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said that nobody concerned in the future of Ireland would be disposed to underestimate the difficulty of the Chief Secretary and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did not wish to criticise the Chief Secretary's speech in any pettifogging or party spirit. There were some of them who passionately believed that an all-round friendly, non-partisan settlement was not merely the only settlement that could be a permanent one of this question, but was the only one that could secure the rest the Irish people desired; and it was just because they considered that such a settlement was something higher and more sacred than any party interests, either English or Irish, that they had sometimes to encounter misapprehension and discouragement on both sides of the House where the party spirit was most deeply ingrained, and on most subjects quite properly and naturally. His one anxiety in criticising the Chief Secretary's speech was to try to see how far his proposals might be capable of happily carrying on the process of pacification and of true nationalisation which had been going on for the past five years, and what he and his friends wanted to try to be assured of was that these proposals might not have the opposite effect of undermining the settlement of 1903 and setting them all back again. He recognised at once the very marked advance in the generous-hearted speech they had heard from the Chief Secretary from the rigid and unbending attitude he took up in his letter to the hon. Member for Cambridge University last March towards a bargain which, he thought, the right hon. Gentleman now recognised, as ninety-nine out of every hundred in Ireland recognised, was the happiest bargain ever entered into between these two peoples. For himself, he said at once as to the main proposals made by the right hon. Gentleman that he would only too gladly jump at them if he could present them in the form of an Act of Parliament instead of in the form of a First Reading speech. The trouble was this action of the Government in introducing a Bill of this magnitude in the dying days of November after the spokesman of the Government in another place, Lord Denman, had announced that it was impossible at this period of the session to pass a Bill through the House of Commons, apart from the House of Lords. He ventured to say that in that particular the position of the Government was indefensible. Here was an emergency which everybody ought to have foreseen. Everybody knew that 1st November was a most critical day. The Departmental Committee of the Treasury in their Report had brought them face to face with a suspension of land purchase for ten years, and that Report was presented so long ago as 15th January last. Lord Dudley's Provisional Report, long and painfully though it was delayed, was presented to the House in the first week of May. He was gratefully conscious of how the Chief Secretary was occupied busily and fruitfully in these months on the Irish University Bill; but since that time what had the Government been doing that it was only now that they were making up their mind as to this Bill? Ever since this session began, they had had a spectacle of irresolution prevailing on the Treasury bench. In one week the Prime Minister, by no choice of his own, went to the astounding discourtesy—time would prove the astounding folly—of refusing even a hearing on this subject to a deputation representing the independent forces of landlords and tenants in the South of Ireland—the greatest union of forces that had ever proceeded from Ireland—a union of forces which the Chief Secretary twenty years ago would have almost given an arm or a leg to have succeeded in having. And yet a week or two afterwards the Chancellor of the Exchequer, going to the opposite extreme, received a deputation, not of friendly landlords and tenants, but belonging to the most irreconcilable section of the landlords without any representative of the tenants. Wherefore had the representative tenants, men of good will, had the door shut in their faces? He did not complain, because kicks and cuffs were always to be expected under such circumstances; but he did not think it was the very wisest statemanship when, at a period of the year when everybody knew it was the only possible chance of getting a good understanding between landlord and tenant, that opportunity was not availed of. More than five weeks ago they pressed the Prime Minister to hurry up with his proposals, if there was to be any practical chance of coming to an arrangement, but in the last week in October the Prime Minister said that he would on the following Wednesday make a comprehensive and satisfying statement on the subject. But on the following Wednesday the introduction of the Bill was delayed for three weeks longer, and when he himself suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that in order to save the Bill it should be introduced and given a Second Reading at once, the very course that was now being pursued with reference to the new Education Bill was taken, and the Prime Minister said that he wished the Bill to be introduced at a date when the Chief Secretary should have an opportunity of making a full explanatory statement upon it. They had had that day a most comprehensive and illuminating speech from the Chief Secretary, but were the Irish Members to accept that speech instead of an Act of Parliament? They had the utmost admiration for the right hon. Gentleman's ability and goodness, and no human being who knew the Chief Secretary's humanity and his very genuine and proved sympathy with the Irish people would for one moment admit that he would attempt to impose on the Irish people the mere phantom of an Irish Bill. But they were not in Saturn, and they objected to be led into a fool's paradise. They thought the result would be a somewhat slender chance of the Chief Secretary's speech materialising into an Act of Parliament this session, and that was, he confessed, most disappointing. As to the practical effect of the Chief Secretary's proposals, so far as he could gather, the weak spot in the Bill was that the tenants would be separated into two different categories or camps—tenants who purchased before 1st November, and those who purchased afterwards. Both would be discontented. Either 200,000 people would be precluded from purchase at all, because the landlords would refuse to accept lower terms, or else they would purchase under totally different conditions, both as to bonus and as to tenants' annuities. Thus, would the dilemma be hastened that the new bargain would be better than the old, or the old better than the new. For his own part he rather apprehended that the new conditions would be more onerous to the tenants, as well as to the landlords, than the old ones; consequently, the new purchasers or those who might fail to purchase, would feel a sense of injustice and of legitimate discontent. They would indeed be entitled to charge that Parliament and the Government with having themselves created that inequality between the two sections of purchasers, and for the simple purpose of saving the Treasury of the richest Empire in the world from a present liability which could not exceed £100,000 a year. For that reason, he was not able to associate himself with the praises of the liberality of the Treasury which, with all its embarrassments at the present moment, was not afraid to add something like £15,000,000 or £20,000,000 to its Budget for most admirable Imperial purposes, no doubt, but not better than the Imperial purpose of a complete settlement of the Irish land question. He was afraid that by its proposal the Government would hereafter bring trouble for themselves, and for Ireland, which he could not contemplate without feelings not very far from despair, when he thought how near they had come and how near they might still go towards completing the greatest legislative reform Ireland had known. The pity was, so far as he had mastered the Chief Secretary's proposals, that he did not think there was a great deal to prevent the striking up of a friendly agreement and a friendly compromise. That was the cruelty of the situation that they were all so near an agreement, and yet with Ireland's usual luck they were all at cross purposes. As to the terms on which the Chief Secretary proposed to pay off the instalments of the arrears of purchase-money, of course from the tenant's point of view it was a most lamentable thing that the right] hon. Gentleman should only propose at the best to remove these arrears by £9,000,000 a year; for thus the arrears would remain oustanding, and both landlord and tenant would be left in the miserable condition in which they were to-day. As to the financial terms offered to the landlords, the £5,000,000 a year, that was really a matter for the landlords themselves. But he hoped that they would show a reasonable spirit, and that every reasonable man among them would go a great way to see whether or not it might not be possible for them, if they wanted to promote payments, to make the best of the existing financial conditions—considering that beyond all doubt if they were harmed in one way by the state of the money market, in another way owing to the present financial condition they were able to invest their purchase-money upon very considerably more advantageous terms than anybody could have foreseen. He hoped that they would remember all that they owed, and they owed a great deal, to the magnanimity and sacrifices of their own countrymen, although they owed very little indeed to the Treasury of England, whose garrison they were once proud to be, and in whose interest or imagined interest, Irish landlordism with all the curses that followed it was created. He passed on to the question of compulsion which was a very terrible word, but he had never believed that not merely in the Congested Districts but all through Ireland there was any irreconcilable difficulty about it. Lord Barrymore, who for thirty years had been the most formidable champion of Irish landlordism, came on to their platform at Cork with the admission that the abolition of landlordism would have to be made complete. This was not a question of compelling landlords to sell; it was a question of compelling the Treasury to pay them for their lands when they were sold and not to allow them to be ruined by money-lenders while they were waiting for their purchase-money. Then there was the great question of grazing, and he thought that anyone who had listened to the sympathetic speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, could have very little doubt that upon that great and mighty question again, the moment they came to particulars, there was no insuperable difficulty whatever about coming to an agreement as to the terms upon which those great grazing ranches in places like Meath and Westmeath and Longford should be taken up. As to the machinery employed, he had always had a very strong feeling against the Congested Districts Board in reference to this particular matter of land purchase. He had always had the feeling that they had simply been muddling away over £1,000,000 of Irish money for the last thirty years and had been toying with this question. That, indeed, was the expression used by the chief toymaker of the Congested Board himself. There, again, the best machinery for working this Act was a question for friendly discussion. It was a secondary question compared with that of by what methods were they to pass this Bill this year, because that was what concerned him. He protested root and branch against this proposal to increase the tenant's annuity by raising the tenants' rate of interest to 3 per cent. It was a re-action against the whole tendency of land legislation in Ireland for the last twenty years, which had been to lessen the tenants' annuity instead of increasing it. The only practical effect, he was sorry to say, would be to goad the tenants into a new struggle with the landlords to settle the new conditions, and whether it was the landlord or tenant who was to bear the burden. While he said that there was no reason why it might not be in some friendly way adjusted if men would only put their heads together. For instance, he thought it might be perfectly possible if the Government would only preserve the full bonus of 12 per cent. and make the apportionment of it between the interest of the landlord and the interest of the tenant—it might be perfectly possible to preserve the existing rate of annuity even without any loss to the Exchequer. The only object of the decrease of the bonus and the change in the tenants' annuity, he thought, was with a view to lowering the prices under the Act, a purpose which would be most heartily sympathised, for he had always held that beyond all manner of doubt the prices of land in Ireland had been something like two years' purchase higher than were ever contemplated by the Land Conference. He said that with the consent of Lord McDonnell and Lord Dunraven. But he said again that that difficulty was by no means an insuperable one if the Government would only make it up to the landlords in another way by relieving them of the frightful legal costs in negotiating sales, and by distributing their purchase money. He did not know whether anybody had studied the schedules of the legal fees which were at present payable by the vendors, but they were perfectly frightful, and a man who was asked to sell his estate was really asked to enter on a long and heavy lawsuit which might last for many years. If the Government would only act generously in accordance with the undoubted intention of the Act of 1903, and relieve the vendors from these costs, in reference to duties which ought properly to be performed by the officers of the Land Commission, nobody except the lawyers would be the losers, and they would then be perfectly and absolutely justified in asking the landlords to accept a lower number of years' purchase, and bring them down to a lower standard. He had often urged that this question of the price ought not to be left to be decided by the fortunes of agrarian war between landlord and tenant, but automatically fixed. Every reasonable landlord now confessed that a fair basis of purchase was a net second term rental, already reduced for the second time by an average of 22 per cent. The Act of 1903 appointed a public trustee, and there was no reason why that official should not be empowered to ascertain beyond "aye" or "nay" by the examination of the estate and its books, what was the actual net second-term rental, and then when he reported what investments were available, then a sum that would produce that net second term rent, already reduced for the second time, would be automatically fixed as the price of the estate. In that way the whole thing would go like clockwork through an impartial administrator. He mentioned this in order to show how comparatively easy it would have been in the last nine months, since the Runciman Report, to have worked out some reasonable accommodation between landlord and tenant, if only a dozen reasonable men had been asked to assemble round a table to dispose of it. Instead of that, every attempt to bring parties together had been discouraged, as if it was some unforgivable crime to England and to Ireland to put an end to the racial and sectarian hatreds which had been for many an age England's misery as well as Ireland's. So far as he knew, no attempt had been made to do what had been done with very considerable success in regard to English education, viz., to see whether it might not be possible to come to some friendly *concordat* on this subject, and in his opinion the differences and passions aroused on the English education question were a great deal more acute than the differences which now separated landlord and tenants in Ireland. But nothing of that kind was done, and now in the expiring weeks of November, this great proposal was thrown upon the Table and landlords and tenants were left to swallow it, without demur, or to take the risk either that land purchase would cease in Ireland or that the new difficulties would have to be settled by entering into a new rental. If he wanted to prove the incapacity of this House to transact Irish business unquestionably what had happened under this Bill would be a crushing proof of it. To him it seemed perfectly shocking to speak of the risk of another no rent war, and God forbid that he should see another in a country which had performed its own engagements under the Land Acts with a fidelity which British statesmen if they were wise would go down on their knees to thank God for. He was afraid to take this risk in order to save the Treasury in a moment of embarrassment from facing, for the highest Imperial purposes, a present liability less than it cost the British taxpayer at the present moment to put down cattle-driving—a liability less than Ireland—poor Ireland—had itself borne out of its development grant, up to the present moment in order to finance an Act which ought to have had behind it the guarantee of the Imperial Treasury. He was afraid no language could exaggerate the dangers or even horrors of allowing this question to remain an open sore even for six months. He believed the Bill could still be saved this session by conciliatory methods. He trusted that even now at the half-past eleventh hour there might be enough of patriotism and generosity and good sense found in all quarters of the House to see whether in everybody's interest there might not be some friendly exchange that might make it possible to tide Ireland over the winter, and tide the Chancellor of the Exchequer over the present embarrassing situation to what they all knew would be more fortunate times. He believed that if the Chief Secretary threw himself upon the country and staked his Chief Secretaryship on carrying this Bill as he did with such conspicuous and triumphant success the Irish University Bill the right hon. Gentleman would find that he had such a force at his back in the shape of the patriotism and good sense of the community that nothing could withstand his efforts. The Chief Secretary said the policy of the Act of 1903 had been an expensive one, but up to this hour that policy, mighty as had been its Imperial results in Ireland, had not cost the English taxpayer a single 6d. outside his share of the bonus. If this policy was not continued, a more expensive matter would be the renewal of the agrarian war in Ireland. No Imperial money was more wisely expended, and if the Government would rapidly and boldly with some sacrifice from the Treasury complete the revolution that had occurred within the last five years and had already put an end to half the trouble in Ireland, they would put an end to the whole of the trouble. He appealed to them to take their courage in both hands and to put their trust in the new spirit of generous national tolerance that was growing up.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said the hon. Member who had just spoken was entitled to a good deal of sympathy for the public spirited and open-handed fashion in which he had faced this problem during the last few months, and their sympathy for him was not lessened by the very unfair attacks which had been made on him by his colleagues. When he heard the Chief Secretary announce that £80,000,000 more was required for this problem, it struck him what a very fortunate position the Leader of the Nationalist Party was in being a British citizen and a Member of an Imperial Legislature. When he heard the hon. Member say it was a matter of life or death to Ireland that this question should be settled, he thought the hon. Member ought to ask himself where would he and his friends have got the money which was required if a Home Rule Parliament in Dublin had been dependent upon Irish resources. One advantage which Unionists could point to in the connection between the United Kingdom and Ireland was that, on occasions of this sort, they could come to the House and rely on Imperial credit. He had heard that there was a policy on foot of wrecking land purchase. When, as an impartial observer, he was asked to draw his own conclusions whether the wreckers had won the day, and were now on top, he was forced to the conclusion that they were. Of course, neither the *Freeman's Journal* nor the hon. Member for Waterford never said they wanted to wreck land purchase. They went through the country suggesting that the price was too high, and that the landlords wanted too much. They disavowed any idea of wrecking land purchase, but they never lost a chance of preventing a sale being completed. When one considered how the hon. and learned Gentleman the Leader of the Nationalist Party said they were not going to have a finance Bill by itself, but were going to have a finance Bill affixed to a Bill which would make the landlords give them what they wanted, then it appeared to him, thinking over the matter in an impartial way, and bringing the best judgment he could bear upon it, that if the wrecking policy wanted to succeed in regard to a Bill like this, if they did not want the additional finance for which legislation was required, what was easier than for them to attach conditions—as the hon. Member for Waterford insisted on doing—to the finance Bill, which in their hearts the wreckers trusted the House of Lords would reject, so that this Bill would be lost and land purchase paralysed? That was his reading of the intentions of the Government, and as every one knew the Chief Secretary only expressed the opinions which had been laid down in various resolutions of the Nationalist Party. The Chief Secretary was the mere mouth-piece of the Nationalist Party. He could understand the position of the Leader of that Party. There were unkind people who said that the Nationalist Party under his guidance had effected nothing, and naturally the hon. Member was interested to get up in the House and say that the Chief Secretary was only voicing the resolutions which the Nationalist Party had passed from time to time. At the same time, if these resolutions were to be tacked on to a finance Bill so that the Lords would not pass them it seemed to him that the policy of wrecking was once more having a very fair chance of success. There were other ways in which the policy of land purchase could be wrecked if one looked at the treaty, as it was called, of 1903. The main, primary, and practically the only intention of the treaty embodied in the Act of 1903 was to transfer the tenanted land from the landlords to the occupiers. That was the real solution of the land purchase problem. That was the transaction, to complete which finance was properly required now and which finance the House was asked by legislation to raise. Hon. Members below the gangway had, he was afraid, captured the Chief Secretary and transformed the problem. It was no longer only a question of the transfer of the untenanted land. The Chief Secretary had said there were £52,000,000 of agreements for the transfer of land, but the people who ought to have come first had come last, and those who ought to have come last had come first. They were the people who were going about driving cattle until they could bully the Chief Secretary into giving them a free farm. Although the Government had tried to repel that and had gone out of their way to fish up contentious matter, there was only one question for the Government to deal with, and that was to find the money to enable existing agreements to be carried out. What message of hope and comfort did this legislative programme carry to the tenants represented by the £52,000,000 of agreements? The promise of the Government was that they were going to get at least £4,000,000 a year, and that if times were good they would get £9,000,000. With £52,000 000 of agreements working off at the average of £6,000,000 a year it would be eight or ten years before the existing transactions had been dealt with. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford had described this as a generous Bill, and purported in the name of the Irish people to bless it in that House. He had heard him bless another Bill not very long ago, which contained provisions for a charge on the Imperial Exchequer, but only to half the amount of the Bill submitted, to what was humourously called the Convention, held in the Mansion House at Dublin. Having blessed it in the House, within a week Balaam was found to have cursed it and withdrawn the approbation which he had expressed.

Was there going to be another Convention to consider this Bill? If there was to be one, and if the hon. Member for Cork, and the hon. and learned Member for North Louth put it freely to them whether they were going to break up the settlement of 1903, and whether they were going to pay an extra quarter per cent. interest, he believed that Convention would repudiate this Bill as a Convention had repudiated the other Bill. The Chief Secretary said he did not wish to delay the purchase or sale of estates still remaining in the country. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman meant by that. Did he mean that new stock was to be created at 3 per cent. which was to be worked on parallel lines and simultaneously with the money which was to be provided for the payment of the £52,000,000? Could the Attorney-General tell them?

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Chancellor of the Exchequer will deal with the matter later.

MR. MOORE said that at present the House was in this difficulty. Either the dealing with the balance of the estates was to work contemporaneously with the working out of the £52,000,000 or it was not. He did not himself see how the two operations could be worked contemporaneously, because they were told that the total output of the Commissioners was only to be £10,000,000 a year, and it was perfectly obvious that, with the time, opportunity, and staff at their disposal, the Commissioners could not begin to deal with the balance of still unsold land, and the 3 per cent. stock to be created, for a period of nine or ten years, and that meant an absolute loss. If, on the other hand, they were told that the two were to be dealt with contemporaneously, what an absurd result followed. The landlords who had agreed to sell to the tenants up to 1st November of this year were to be put off for a period of eight years, with £4,000,000, or perhaps £6,000,000 a year. The landlord who sold after 1st November went on the market and immediately was paid 3 per cent. stock. But what was going to be the position if the 3 per cent. stock was postponed for eight or nine years until the £52,000,000 was disposed of? Who could tell what the state of the money market would be then? Yet they were going to make it obligatory—if the Bill passed—on a man to accept stock in nine or ten years of which no Member of that House could forecast the value. It was not business, and it was not justice, and so far as that part of the subject was concerned, the Government were sublimely indifferent to it, judging by their ideas of other Irish legislation. The fact was there was only one question in dealing with the Irish problem, and that was to find the money. There was no doubt that in the debates which took place in that House on the Act of 1903, although it was not expressed in that measure, the underlying idea was that where the landlord and tenant had agreed to terms of purchase, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, it was the absolute duty of the Treasury, on the true construction of the Act, to advance the money within a reasonable time. Unfortunately the point had never been raised, but an eminent legal authority had given the opinion that this was undoubtedly the law. No one had suggested that under the Act of 1903 the British Treasury could not fulfil its obligations within a reasonable time. Instead of now saying that the money was to be advanced within a reasonable time, the policy of the Government was that the people were to be starved and pinched by a miserable £4,000,000 a year in the course of the next eight, or nine, or ten years. With regard to the numerous Amendments foreshadowed by the Chief Secretary, he thought that if ever a mother had overlain her child it had been done in this case. The Chief Secretary had gone out of his way to bury the most important part of the Act in a mass of vexatious and absolutely unnecessary Amendments. The *Freeman's Journal* had been denouncing the zone system, and the right hon. Gentleman, while preserving that system in name, allowed the Commissioners to tamper and interfere with it; but the very instant they made inspection necessary in the case of those holdings, they multiplied by ten or twenty the work of the Estates Commissioners. Yet the Chief Secretary said there was no intention whatever of arresting the progress of land purchase. The *Freeman's Journal* had advocated the abolition of the bonus system and the substitution of a sliding scale, and here again the Chief Secretary had capitulated. The scale would go as far as 16 per cent. in some cases. It was like the case of the Irish school where, when flour was cheap and meat dear, the master said that the boy who ate the most pudding should have the most meat. They had the vendor and tenant coming to an agreement, and the tenant said to the vendor: "The lower you sell to me, the higher bonus you will get from the Treasury." Of course, hon. Members below the gangway, representing Irish constituencies, would be very glad to leave the whole financial burden on the Imperial Treasury. But when the Chief Secretary professed himself to be the guardian of the Treasury as well as of the interest of the landlord and tenant, it was only fair to point out where his proposal would lead to. The fact was, the right hon. Gentleman had adopted the proposal without fully understanding it, but because it emanated from the *Freeman's Journal* he felt bound to accept it. Another difficult question, which was dealt with in the Report of the Dudley Commission, was this: When they did acquire these grazing tracts or ranches in the West of Ireland, to whom were they going to give them? Were they going to give them to the "landless men"? The Chief Secretary had glided very gracefully over this point. He said the question whether the landless men from the congested districts should get these tracts, or whether the small farmers in the neighbourhood should have them, was a question to be settled by Irish opinion. But who was to hold the balance between those two classes? The Dudley Report said the people who were to get the preference were the small farmers who had holdings, and not the people who were imported from another neighbourhood. The Chief Secretary, not being quite sure what policy the *Freeman's Journal* might announce about it, said it was a matter which should be left to Irish opinion. They had heard a great deal from the Chief Secretary about the policy of breaking up these grasslands and going in for mixed farming. For himself, he believed that mixed farming afforded the best means of making the people of Ireland prosperous and thriving—that was to say, in those parts of the country where mixed farming was possible. The land must not only be suitable, but they should have the people desirous for it. That was the cardinal point of all. In the West a man wanted to have as little tillage as possible, and to get as much land as possible with an advance from the State as a loan annuity. But the last thing he dreamt of was to break it up and convert it into a mixed farm. Two advertisements in the *Tuam Herald* for 25th April of this year showed how the land policy of the Government was working out. In one there were 400 acres to be sold. The grazing system was condemned by the Chief Secretary and by landless men and tenants when they wanted to get holdings, but when they got them what did they do?—

> "'Subscriber' has received instructions from the tenants on the estate of Clanmoor to sell the said lands in suitable divisions of from 10 to 100 acres and upwards for grazing."

Immediately below that was another advertisement of—

> "prime grazing land about 200 acres, in suitable divisions,"

and so forth—

> "The tenants on the property of Mr. T. R. Roche, having purchased the grass farm of Rashira, six miles from Tuam and ten miles from Galway, have instructed 'Subscriber' to offer for sale the said land by public auction on Monday, 4th May, 1908."

The result now of the operations in the West of Ireland with these grazing lands was that the tenants formed themselves into a syndicate, got advances from their obliging friends, the Estates Commissioners, the lands were allotted to them, they were never really divided, the syndicate instructed the auctioneer to put them up, not for mixed farming, and owing to the State transaction the tenants were able to keep the land in the grazing which they had so consistently denounced. Yet in Connaught they were told there were to be special powers and a special body created to settle this great problem of congestion and the division of the population. It was a highly contentious matter that they should have a Congested Districts Board armed with powers to take land compulsorily when nine members of it were to be representatives of local bodies, because again and again these county councils had passed political resolutions dealing with the question of the land. Their members would not have been returned if they did not share the popular view, and the popular view about the price of land in Connaught was that every shilling that was paid to the vendor was a sheer waste, especially when out of the public purse, and the idea of putting nine of these gentlemen on the Board with compulsory powers was unnecessary, irritating, and absurd, and could only bring about the defeat of the Bill if the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford was going to take the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill. As to compulsion it was really a rather extraordinary come down for the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture, because he was the apostle of compulsory sale.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): It is a bigger come down for you.

MR. MOORE said that at the last election in Ulster the right hon. Gentleman himself, and the few dependents he sent to represent him at other elections in different constituencies, told the electors, where they were articulate—he meant the dependents, not the electors—that as soon as this great and good Liberal Government came into power the whole of the land of Ireland would be dealt with on compulsory lines. Individual landlords in each constituency were singled out and these obedient candidates, when they could make themselves understood, said: "Only return the Liberal Party to power and Mr. So-and-so will be obliged to sell." They had had the Liberal Party in power —and they had found it out to their cost—for the last three years, but there was no longer a question of Mr. So-and-so being obliged to sell. The matter was left the same as ever. £1,000,000 a year was to be placed at the disposal of the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners for different parts of the country. It was only to be used, on the Chief Secretary's statement, for the relief of congestion.

MR. CHERRY: That is not so.

MR. MOORE asked what was it to be used for. A minute ago the Attorney-General was unable to state what was the main provision in the Bill with reference to the interdependence of the two methods of payment of the two stocks. He was now perfectly ready to say it was not so although his chief said it was so.

MR. CHERRY: I was anxious to relieve the hon. and learned Member from a misapprehension. There is no restriction as regards the Estates Commissioners as far as I understand.

MR. MOORE: Are we to understand that £1,000,000 a year is devoted to the exercise of compulsory powers or is there more?

MR. CHERRY: Yes, £1,000,000 a year I understand.

MR. MOORE: Are we also to understand that the £1,000,000 a year is to be divided between the Congested Districts Board and the Estates Commissioners?

MR. CHERRY: Yes.

MR. MOORE: I said that, and I want to know where I was wrong. I said the compulsory powers were to be exercised by the Estates Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board for the relief of congestion. Is that wrong?

MR. CHERRY: The hon. and learned Gentleman is wrong as regards the Estates Commissioners. He is right as regards the Congested Districts Board as I understand it.

MR. MOORE said the hon. and learned Gentleman told them a minute ago that he understood the whole thing. What was the Congested Districts Board to have for congestion in Connaught if the Estates Commissioners carried it off for other purposes in Ireland? The Chief Secretary said the work done in Connaught would be limited by the fact that they only had £1,000,000 to spend there. He also said that in other parts of Ireland which were not scheduled there were portions which they might leave to the Estates Commissioners although they were congested, thereby actually carrying out the very findings of the Dudley Commissioners. If the Chief Secretary was asked whether their share of the £1,000,000 a year was to be given to the Estates Commissioners for the rest of Ireland he had no doubt he would once more throw the Attorney-General overboard as he had done on many occasions. He wanted to point out what compulsion had come to—the policy which was to make a new heaven and a new earth when the Vice-President was looking for votes. It had come down to a solitary £1,000,000 a year which was to be divided between the Congested Districts Board in Connaught and the Estates Commissioners in other parts of the country. The right hon. Gentleman would still remain a Member of the Government. He would do that if the Government put into the Bill a clause under which there would no longer be any compulsion in Ireland. Why should he not? He had got there and they wished him joy of it, and he was a great asset to them while he remained on the Government Bench. When the Irish public who were interested in this matter—and that included ratepayers as well as tenants and occupiers—came to look at the Bill as a whole, there was simply one provision by which they got the very least benefit. He was prepared to hear the hon. and learned Member for Waterford assure the tenant purchaser that it really was a benefit to him to have to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on his annuity, and the Vice-President would tell them it was an absolute blessing. It would make them work harder and the more they worked the more they would reap for the Government. But from the point of view of what was tangible the only matter which the Irish ratepayer came in for was that the contingent liability, amounting at the very outside to £660,000 a year, might be removed from his shoulders and put on to the Imperial Exchequer. There would be no liability at all if land stock exceeded the hypothetical price that the Chief Secretary said. That liability only existed to that extent while land stock remained at $88\frac{5}{8}$. Of course if the Government remained in power it would be absolutely impossible for land stock to rise to anything like par, but it was not improbable in the course of the next sixty-eight and a half years that Consols would rise considerably above $88\frac{5}{8}$ so that all the Irish ratepayer got—and it was the only pennyworth of bread to a monstrous quantity of sack—was relief from the contingent liability—which might never be half the size—to the extent in the next sixty-eight and a half years of some £660,000. If for the sake of that they were to be plunged in controversial legislation of this sort it would be brought home to the Irish ratepayers, who would rather allow matters to work out as they were if the Government would simply fulfil their elementary duty of finding the money to enable it to be done instead of playing to the clamour of the cattle-driver in the North and West and the *Freeman's Journal* in Dublin. He understood if there was to be purchase for those who were only entering into their agreements now the time for completion in their case would be very largely postponed. He could quite understand that if a man entered into an agreement now it might be ten years before he would receive his purchase money. He asked the Government were they prepared to fulfil their other duty with regard to vendor and purchaser in that case? They ought to see that that man had a free market. They ought to see that in the meantime he was not to be intimidated or forced either by indirect process of the Estates Commissioners or by direct process of the United Irish League into parting or selling or being intimidated out of his holding. All over the South and West of Ireland this intimidation was going on. It was coupled with overt acts, and the Government stood by, and by putting an odd policeman here and there and sending a patrol at a time when he was not likely to meet anyone they said they had discharged their duty. If this was going to be a fair transaction the Government ought to see at least that a ring was kept until the transaction could be completed. This was not in the ordinary sense playing the game, and although he knew what he had said would fall upon deaf ears, in the interests of the peace and tranquility of Ireland, it was the duty of the Government to see that due and adequate protection was given to a fair and free bargain.

*Mr. KAVANAGH (Carlow) said that as a Member of the Royal Commission on Congestion he would like to say one or two words on that part of the Bill as far as it related to Ireland. In case, however, anyone might think that if he only spoke on that part of the Bill he was unfavourable to the rest of it, he would like to say at once that he was entirely in favour of compulsory purchase. They recommended compulsory purchase in their Report, and he did not think there was anyone, not even the hon. Member for North Armagh, who did not believe that compulsory purchase was absolutely necessary in those areas. The work of the Congested Districts Board was absolutely stopped for want of that power. The reason the Royal Commission did not recommend compulsory powers outside those areas was that they considered that the Estates Commissioners had a much easier task outside than the Congested Districts Board had inside those areas. They had a much larger area, and could obtain untenanted land much easier, but inside those areas the Congested Districts Board found that compulsory purchase was absolutely necessary. He was glad the Government had followed nearly, if not entirely, the lines of the Report of the Commission. The members of the Royal Commission spent an enormous amount of time and trouble over their Report, and he was very glad indeed to hear the few words the Chief Secretary said about the chairman, who had been a most hardworking and painstaking member of the Commission. The Chief Secretary had alluded with a little levity to the number of motor cars employed, but how could they have covered such a vast district and held so many meetings without the use of motor cars? He was particularly glad that the Congested Districts Board was going to be reconstructed, and that it was going to retain its old name. There was a good deal in the old name, "Congested Districts Board," because it had won the confidence and trust of the people. When he began his investigations upon the Royal Commission he had a perfectly open mind about the rival claims of the Estates Commissioners and the Congested Districts Board, and if anything he was rather inclined to favour the Estates Commissioners, because he thought there were too many Boards in Ireland. Anyone who had listened to the great chorus of evidence in favour of the Congested Districts Board, from Donegal to Cork, could only conclude that if congestion was to be relieved properly and quickly it must be done by the Congested Districts Board. Those who did not know the West of Ireland must be told that any scheme of migration was very difficult to carry out and required great tact and knowledge of the people. If, at the beginning of their Report, they had gone against the wishes and evidence put before them, and recommended that the Estates Commissioners should have taken the place of the Congested Districts Board, they would have done that which would have been fatal to the relief of congestion. The constitution of the Board was to be somewhat changed. The Report of the Commission recommended three paid members, and the reason they did that was on account of the difficulty experienced in forming a quorum. The Board only sat once a month, and between the sittings it was very hard to find the members, and if they had three paid members they would sit from day to day, people would be able to find them when they wanted them, and that was very essential. The hon. Member for North Armagh was horrified that there should be such a thing as a representative of the people on the Board, but such representatives were absolutely necessary to carry out the scheme. They could not make a hard-and-fast rule in a matter of this kind. If they desired to carry out a very difficult task like migration they must have representatives of the counties concerned on the Board. He was glad the areas were to follow the lines recommended in the Report, and he was pleased the Government had not listened to those who tried to persuade them that the definition was better than an area. Every one of the definitions had broken down upon investigation, and they came to the conclusion that the only way congestion could be relieved in the West of Ireland was by giving a large area to the Board and giving them absolute power within that area. The hon. Member for North Armagh was very much exercised in mind as to who was going to get the untenanted land. The Commission had much evidence on that point placed before it, and he confessed that there was a good deal of difficulty and misunderstanding upon it. He could, however, assure the House that he would never have put his name to the Report—and he was sure his colleagues would not have done so—unless he believed that the untenanted land would be taken for the relief of congestion and for that only. Within the area which the Government proposed, and which the Commission recommended, only untenanted land was dealt with for the relief of congestion and the Board constituted by the Government would carry out the relief of congestion first, and if there was any balance after that had been done they would dispose of it elsewhere. In regard to the finance of the Bill he was glad to see that the income of the Board, which hitherto had been very inadequate, was to be raised from £186,000 to £250,000, and that was a very good rise. Some hon. Members thought it was too small, but he believed it was a good workable income, and as the compulsory powers would naturally make the loss on purchase and resale less, they would find that £250,000 was a very good sum to work with. A great many people would consider that was a very large sum, and they were inclined to look upon every vote given to Ireland for that purpose as money going to be lost in charity to Ireland. They did not want charity, and they only wanted their just share from the Imperial Exchequer. He ventured to assert that this was the very best use public money could possibly be put to, because they were investing their money in the industry of the hardest working people in the world, and this Bill, if passed, would simply mean the opening of the prison doors of congestion which would let out the people on to the land upon which their fathers and forefathers had worked. The people would do the rest, and they would change the whole face of the country, making the land hum with their industry. He was aware that every promoter of a Land Bill said his own particular measure would be absolutely the last. He profoundly believed that this would be the last. [Cries of "No, no."] He held that opinion because land purchase, with its relief of congestion, and the settlement of the vexed question of the price of land, would do all that was required. He hoped that when the landlords looked into the question of compulsion they would decide to support as he supported that principle, because he firmly believed that it would do injury to nobody and it was, he was sure, a great and necessary reform for Ireland.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in the House, because he wished to say a few words upon the financial aspect of this question. He did not understand very clearly from the speech of the Chief Secretary what the exact operation of the financial proposals of this Bill would be, and he would be very much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman if he would kindly set him right if he made any errors in what he believed the Chief Secretary stated to be the financial basis of his proposals. He would first say a word or two on the question of the total amount. His right hon. friend the Member for Dover was under the impression that the total amount of money required to be raised would be £120,000,000, whilst the Chief Secretary put the sum required at £180,000,000. In his own business career he had come across estimates of great mining engineers, and he generally found they were very much less than the actual cost of the work when completed. He could not see what motive the Chief Secretary could have in over-estimating the cost of the purchase of this land, and he was inclined to think the amount would be quite £180,000,000 and probably a little more. He understood that up to the present time something like £25,000,000 had been spent in paying landlords for estates acquired and that agreements had already been entered into involving £52,000,000. The average was 3½ per cent. on the outlay instead of 3¼ which they would have to pay if the State had found the money as under the Act of 1903. Therefore, he listened with a great deal of curiosity to ascertain in what way the Chief Secretary meant to meet this want. So far as he understood the matter, the right hon. Gentleman was not going to meet it at all. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he was going to increase the output of the Estates Commissioners. Up to the present, they had arranged for spending on purchase £5,000,000 a year, but for the future it would amount to £10,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman said that in order to keep up the credit of the country, he did not think it would be possible to raise by loan in the market more than £5,000,000 a year, and, therefore, there would at once be a deficit of £5,000,000. What was to become of the £52,000,000 arranged for and not paid? The Chief Secretary said he was going to give the landlord the option of taking his money in 2¾ per cent. stock at ninety-two, or part in stock and part in money. At the price at which the stock stood at present, there would be an immediate loss of something like 4½ per cent. He did not know why a landlord should take stock on which undoubtedly he would lose 4½ per cent. of the purchase money. He told his right hon. friend the Member for Dover in 1903 that he would no more be able to get the money than to fly, and that statement had been verified. He also told his right hon. friend that when it came to the point there would be a deficit which the taxpayers would have to pay. They had not paid anything for it, but the Government had put the charge on the Imperial revenue. He maintained that when it was known in the city that £180,000,000 would be required instead of £100,000,000 they would not be able to find the money at the price to be given, and consequently the loss to the landlord would be still greater. It was not at all likely that the landlords would elect to take their money in this stock. Then the Chief Secretary stated that there was to be another 3 per cent. stock which the landlord could take if he liked at par. Here he might say that the 2¾ per cent. stock at 92 yielded about 3 per cent. so that there was little difference except as to the possibility of redemption. Eventually he presumed if everything went on well in the country the 2¾ per cent. stock might be paid off, and, although they need not put it too high there was a little advantage in that. The landlords had the option of taking the 2¾ per cent. stock at 92 or the 3 per cent. stock at 100.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): The 3 per cent. only applies to future purchases.

SIR F. BANBURY said that was what he was going to ask. Did it apply only to sales after the passing of this Bill?

MR. ANNAN BRYCE: Yes that is what I understood the Chief Secretary to say. It applies to the £52,000,000 not completed.

SIR F. BANBURY asked whether the £5,000,000 the right hon. Gentleman was going to raise was to be issued as 2¾ or 3 per cent. stock?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would reply to the hon. Baronet later.

SIR F. BANBURY said the 2¾ per cent. stock was likely to go lower than he had thought. His idea was that the Chief Secretary said that any landlord who had sold could take the price in stock at 92. There would have been a possibility if the credit of the country improved, of a rise in the price, and that might have been an inducement to take it. But if money was to continue to be raised, it stood to reason that there would be stock continually coming on the market, and the chance of this stock rising would be very remote. It would have been better if the Chief Secretary had issued his new stock at 3 per cent. than in this particular form. He could not himself see the advantage of having another stock issue. He would point out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that when Mr. Goschen converted consols first to 2¾ and then to 2½ per cent. in 1888 there were then three different kinds of stocks. When Mr. Goschen consolidated these stocks into one, all financiers and even railway companies endeavoured to pursue the same policy. It was supposed at that time to be an excellent policy.

Mr. Goschen afterwards rather spoiled it by creating the local loans. The Chancellor of the Exchequer should have stopped the issue of the 2¾ per cent. stock altogether and given Consols to the landlords. He would have been able to obtain Consols at 3s. 6d. per cent. cheaper and that would have been a saving to the tenants and to the English taxpayers. If that had been done, the right hon. Gentleman would have had a readier market than he had by creating this different kind of stock limited in amount.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE asked what would be the effect on Consols.

SIR F. BANBURY said it would not be a very good effect. The Chancellor of the Exchequer must not forget that people were now selling Consols in order to buy local loans, Irish land, and other Government loans, because they were guaranteed by the Government. The security was as good in the one case as in the other. They were selling Consols to go into the higher paid stocks. By creating these higher paid stocks the Government were creating competition against themselves. The most businesslike way would have been to issue Consols. If that had been done, the British taxpayer would have saved money and the Irish landlord would have had a much more marketable security, and he believed the effect on the whole market would have been good. He would like to know when the issue of the 3 per cent. stock was going to take place. Was it to be for all new purchases?

MR. ANNAN BRYCE said there were £35,000,000 of completed purchases, and £52,000,000 of pending purchases. It was for the latter that the 2¾ per cent. stock was being created.

SIR F. BANBURY said he understood the Chief Secretary to say that he would not in any year issue more than £5,000,000.

*MR. BIRRELL said that what he stated was that, although it was no part of the Bill, it was not the intention to raise more than £5,000,000 cash in each year.

SIR F. BANBURY said he understood that the result of the arrangement would be that the tenant would have to pay 3½ instead of 3¼ per cent. That confirmed more than ever his impression that to have two stocks going at the same time was a very great mistake. It would be much better to consolidate all the stocks in one stock. The Imperial taxpayer was to bear the cost of the flotation, and that he must say filled him with a great deal of apprehension. The hon. Member for Waterford said that one of the objections to the plan of the Chief Secretary was that there was not sufficient money to be raised in any given year, and he further said that he could not raise more than a given amount in any year unless the state of the money market improved, because it was necessary to keep up the credit of the country. If the loss on the flotation was to be borne by the taxpayer, what did it matter to hon. Gentlemen from Ireland what the loss was?

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): We from Ireland are also British taxpayers, and this is only being done with our own money.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was aware of that. But the population of Ireland was 4,000,000 as against 38,000,000 in England, Scotland, and Wales, so that the proportion received from the larger population would be very much greater. He was sure the hon. Gentleman would not wish England to pay everything as the money was going to benefit the people of Ireland. That did not take away in the least from his argument that the purchases would be congested. His own idea, so far as he could see, was that there was not going to be a very great rise in the money market. This was a very serious matter and he was endeavouring so far as he could to deal with it in a serious spirit. They must not forget that the next Budget was going to be a rather difficult subject. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find that out. There would be a very large sum of money to raise, and what with the proposals of the Government of a very socialistic tendency—which were exerting a very serious effect in the City—it would be difficult to get people to invest their money in English securities so as to raise the money. It did not seem to him that there was to be a very rosy time in the near future for these securities. The hon. Gentleman said that every Irish Land Bill was going to be the last. He did not believe that this would be the last unless the unforeseen happened. This was more than a Nationalist question, because the loss on the quotation would be borne by the English taxpayer. The cattle-driving would go on; another Bill would be brought in, and the unfortunate British taxpayer would have to pay the piper. Passing from the financial question, he wished to say a word about the question of compulsion. He must say that he was extremely sorry that compulsion had been brought in. The Chief Secretary had drawn eloquent pictures of the condition of the people in the congested districts, which no doubt were not in the least exaggerated. His only alternatives were that the land under cultivation should be increased, or migration. But, supposing that the land in the congested districts was given to these poor people, in twenty-five years from now they would have children growing up desirous of getting on to the land too. Was the right hon. Gentleman going to take steps to prevent the increased land being divided up?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: It cannot be done.

SIR F. BANBURY said that that took away some of his objections; but the population of Ireland would increase, and if they desired land were they to get it? If the people could not get the land the only alternative, in his view, was that they should emigrate.

*MR. BIRRELL: Or migrate to the land that they can get.

SIR F. BANBURY asked what arable land was there which they could get? He was a little bit of a farmer himself, and he liked to lay down his land in grass. He had always understood that these rich grazing lands were fat and some of the best lands in the country. If these lands were cut up into arable land they would have to have more horses and more labour, and that would make it much more expensive to work. He did not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer was enamoured of his Patents Bill, but was he going to have a Patents Bill for Ireland to encourage the export of wheat and oats? He had endeavoured to treat this measure, especially the financial part of it, seriously, and he was doubtful of the result of it. He did not believe that the Act would be final any more than the Act of 1903 had been. Unless there was very considerable modification of the Bill he would be compelled to vote against it. He hoped they would be allowed to discuss it after it was introduced without the guillotine; and as it was an extremely important measure he was quite sure that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would like to discuss it fully.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) thought that the criticisms of the hon. Baronet as to the issue of stock were very sound. He himself believed that the new stock would fetch a better price if all the stocks were consolidated. He doubted the desirability of introducing a further complication in the Irish land stocks. There was a possibility of its introducing friction between the different classes of stockholders in Ireland, and he asked the Government to reconsider their decision on that point. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London had expressed doubts with regard to the breaking up of grass lands, but if he read the Dudley Commission Report, although a good deal of it was stodgy, he would see that the greater portion of the grazing lands was at one time under cultivation, as was evident from the old rigg and furr.

SIR F. BANBURY: The price of grain was higher then.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE did not think it was much higher. The object of the landlords in clearing the people off these lands was not economic; it was, to a large extent, social and political. His belief was that it would be sound policy if these grazing lands, or a large portion of them, were again brought under cultivation; and that a better return and a larger return of wealth to the country would be got than if they were kept under grass. Of course, there were undoubted exceptions to that in Roscommon and Galway, where it would be always more economic to keep a certain proportion of the land under grass. A large part of the new expenditure of the Congested Districts Board would be the difference between the price they paid to the landlord and the price they would be able to get from the tenant; while the cost of the re-arrangement of the land for settlement would amount on the average to 13 per cent. The amount granted was a smaller sum than was recommended by the Commission, and the reduction would delay the complete settlement of the question, and instead of taking twenty-five years it would take thirty years, because as they gave a smaller or larger amount they would get through the work quicker or slower. The hon. Member for Carlow had given them a very interesting speech, and touched upon some of the points the Commission had to consider. He mentioned the fact that the Commission had, after great discussion, settled upon the principle of representation of the localities in Ireland. In a very able note which was written by Lord McDonnell they would find that conclusion controverted. He quite understood that there was a good deal to be said for the argument of Lord McDonnell, but the majority of Commissioners felt that as this Congested Districts Board had been the only board in the past which had received any part of the funds it was necessary to preserve its character. It would not have been necessary to do that if the Council Bill which the right hon. Gentleman proposed last year had been carried. He was very sorry it was not passed although he did not think it was a good Bill. It was not pretentious, but at the same time it would have been a beginning, and one thing was certain, that these complicated provisions which were necessary under the recommendations of this Commission, would not have been necessary, as it would have been perfectly easy to have left everything of that kind to the Irish Council. If Home Rule were to come to-morrow none of these complicated provisions would be necessary, and the sooner the House realised that the better. In every Irish matter, the complications which were introduced were due entirely to the fact that under the present system of Castle government in Ireland there could not be that freedom of choice on the part of the people which, under a Home Rule system, they would be able to afford. Under a Home Rule system, therefore, they would find that all these complicated questions would be done away with. The hon. Member for Carlow and the hon. Baronet for the City of London alluded to the question of migration, and as to that ten years ago it would have been said that the difficulties were insuperable. But of late years it had been found that there was a growing readiness on the part of many of these poor cottagers in the West of Ireland to take the better chance which was offered to them by migration even to a place some distance off, rather than go to a country with which they were not familiar. But the obstacle still existed that a great many of the people were not at present in the state of education or knowledge which would render their transfer desirable. At the present moment it would be absolutely impossible to expect any good results from the migration of the cottagers, and some other way of dealing with them must be devised. He thought they might do something more than they were doing in the way of re-creation of industries on the coast of Galway. There existed the fishing industry, but he did not think that quite sufficient attention had been paid by the Congested Districts Board in the past to its development and to making it the success which it had been made on the coast of Donegal. He trusted that the Congested Districts Board, who would have to continue this work, would in future be able to devote a larger amount of time and greater expenditure to the development of fisheries along the coast of Galway. One other thing which might be of assistance in the regions of Ireland it was most difficult to help would be an extensive programme of afforestation. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to that, and he thought that in regard to the particularly difficult part of the Irish coast afforestation would afford a far better chance of providing for the needs of the people than even perhaps the development of the fisheries. There was an immense expanse of rough mountain land in that district which would be eminently suitable for planting, and in that way they would furnish a large amount of work, when no agricultural programme was likely to give much assistance to the people in this region. In order to have migration to other and more favoured parts there must necessarily be a growth of strong patriotic feeling in the country. In the causes which produced cattle-driving there had been shown a strong local desire on the part of the people to have a division of the grass land made among themselves. That was a very natural impulse, but it was one which, if gratified to any large extent, would destroy, in a great degree, any chance of carrying out a system of migration. If, therefore, their hon. friends on the other side of the House would make it their duty and their pleasure to try and excite in all parts of Ireland affected by these proposals a patriotic feeling in the direction that they must subordinate all private and local desires in the distribution of the land to the general welfare of the country at large, only in that way could they hope to see the question of congestion finally settled. There were many other points to which he would like to allude, but probably there would be an opportunity on the Second Reading of discussing them. He would therefore only congratulate the right hon. Gentleman and the Government upon the broad way in which they had looked at this question, and upon the very generous spirit with which, on the whole, they had dealt with it.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) wished to say a word first about the land purchase side of this question, but prefaced his observations by remarking that he recognised gladly the progress that had been made in the mind of the Government since an earlier time this year when, in July, through their spokesman in the House of Lords, they said most decisively that the British taxpayer could not be called upon to undertake any further burden in respect of land purchase in Ireland. He also recognised that there was a change for the better, since he received an uncompromising letter from the Chief Secretary at a later date, at the beginning of October. He felt sure that the Chief Secretary had meanwhile done his best to ease the situation and to expedite land purchase. All the same, he was afraid that there would be profound disappointment in Ireland, and that the proposals that were now made did not go far enough to meet the extreme difficulty as to finance. As regarded completed agreements, the block in land purchase would, he was afraid, continue and sales would be hung up, if not for quite so long a time as they would have been otherwise, still for a time quite sufficient to create a situation of danger and disorder. As regarded future agreements, he greatly feared that the proposals would bring land purchase almost to a standstill. He need not go into the financial question at any length, especially after the exhaustive treatment it received from his right hon. friend the Member for Dover, but he would point out this—that the Government, in his opinion, had done a very bad turn to Ireland in tying up together two measures so different as the expediting of land purchase and the relief of congestion; and with this result, that the failure of one of these measures meant the failure of both. Yet the one policy—that of land purchase—was accepted by everybody both in Ireland and in the United Kingdom, while the other policy called forth the greatest possible divergence of view, and opened up the most difficult and most complicated of all Irish problems. That these two policies should be so inextricably united was, he thought, a misfortune. Not only was there this difference as regards the two policies, but there was also great difference of opinion respecting machinery in each case. In the case of land purchase nobody wished to alter appreciably the existing machinery, but merely to quicken it. In the case of the Congested Districts Board the machinery to be employed called forth even greater divergencies of opinion than did the policy itself. The Chief Secretary referred to Lord McDonnell as in the main supporting the policy, but he did not mention the smashing attack which Lord McDonnell made upon the machinery proposed by the majority of the Commission, and accepted by the Government. Further there was this difference. The carrying out of the one policy was a matter urgent in the highest degree; the carrying out of the other policy was indeed a matter of anxious interest and importance, but it could not be said to be bound up at this moment with the whole interests of public order and public safety. The Chief Secretary in his exhaustive speech did not seem to him to bring out the inherent difficulties, social and economic, that were involved in the problem of the congested districts. There were two entirely different questions. One was the question of policy, the other that of the machinery to give effect to it. If the proposed policy was to be carried out, then the Congested Districts Board should, in his opinion, be abolished, in spite of the good work it had done. But the policy seemed to him to raise great doubt. The colossal scale on which it was proposed to work, and the magnitude of these operations, should be borne in mind. It was proposed to bring every uneconomic holding up to an economic standard which was put at a £10 holding. At the present time seven-eighths of the holdings in the congested area were under £10 poor law valuation. There were no less than 50,000 of these holdings in the existing area, their valuation being £50,000; and in the new area to be created by this Bill there were 30,000 more. One-third of the whole of Ireland was made a congested district. The additional land required to give effect to the scheme was land to the amount, in poor law valuation of £450,000. They must therefore purchase land of a total valuation of £800,000, to be divided among 80,000 families. The sum to be advanced as estimated by Lord McDonnell was £40,000,000 or £50,000,000, with an irrecoverable loss which his Lordship placed at £7,000,000, but which others placed at £4,500,000 to £5,000,000. Was it possible that such huge and unprecedented operations should be carried out by a Board nine of whose eighteen members were to be elected by local authorities, and from the nature of the case would be subject to every kind of political and social pressure? Then as to the land required for this purpose. The whole of the untenanted land in Connaught, Donegal, Sligo, Kerry, and a large part of Cork was to be bought up, and even that was not enough. The majority of the Commission actually recommended that they should "fine down" existing holdings, so that no tenants and no tenant purchasers were to be allowed to have farms of more than a £100 valuation. They were prepared to get rid of all the strong farmers in Ireland, all the men on whom the future development of farming was dependent, and who were indispensable now that the landlords were being bought out. The large farmers would henceforth be the chief employers of labour, and the only men who could give a lead in scientific agriculture. He was, anyhow, thankful that the Government rejected that proposal, which would not only have been economically disastrous, but would have led to downright war. But the Government scheme also contemplated migration on an enormous scale. It reminded him of events to be read of in ancient history, when oriental monarchs deported whole populations, a thing never done in civilised times. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Except by Irish landlords.] It looked as if some oriental imagination had been running riot in the construction of the scheme. No less than 20,000 or 30,000 families—the numbers were variously estimated—had to be migrated.

*MR. BIRRELL: If they can go to Canada, why cannot they go to another county?

*MR. BUTCHER said the right hon. Gentleman's illustration did not apply. This was in effect compulsory migration. There were three enormous difficulties in the way of the Government scheme—the existing landholders did not want to quit; the "congests," or would-be migrants, did not wish to be migrated; and the local landless men, who claimed the right to any land that was going, threatened war against the introduction of strangers until their own "landhunger" had been satisfied. He had read a number of resolutions passed by branches of the United Irish League with regard to the migrants. This was a specimen—

> "They must not be brought in until the small people and the landless people are supplied with land, and when this is done, we have no objection to giving these migrants any surplus lands remaining, but otherwise we pledge ourselves to rout the migrants from our midst."

These facts ought to be impressed on the House. Suppose therefore that this new Board, with its large elective element, subject to all the pressure of local politics, preferred the claims of the local men to those of the migrants, the whole object of the Bill would be lost. It would be an impossible task to import into a district whole families of men who had already been called grabbers and whose lives would be made intolerable. There was a phrase used by the Chief Secretary which seemed to indicate that he was aware of this danger. He said "an army of police cannot be maintained to offer protection to migrants." Did he mean that the landless man was to get the land instead of the migrant who could not be protected? If so, the Government scheme fell to the ground. If not, the only other alternative was that the "congests" were indeed to be migrated but were not to be protected, and were to go to their new homes at their own risk. They knew what would be the consequence. The Government however by their administration had already killed their own policy of migration, because they had raised the hopes of lawless and landless men to such a pitch that the migration scheme was doomed. He desired lastly to lay stress on the economic side of this proposed social revolution. The economic side was one which admitted of argument. He had read a great deal about the substitution of mixed farming for grass lands, and he had consulted people who knew infinitely more than he did; and he thought if they could be sure of substituting in Ireland a system of mixed farming for the grazing system that the economic result might be all to the good. At the same time, looking at the enormous difficulties of altering the farming tradition and methods of any country, he felt grave doubts whether they could establish that mixed system of scientific farming which alone could replace the system of grazing. What was more likely was that they would merely set up a large number of small graziers instead of a small number of large graziers, and what would be the result? They would have poor men with small farms on which they could not rear good cattle. They would have poor stock, an inferior breed of stock throughout Ireland, and the whole cattle industry of Ireland would suffer; and the first to suffer would be the people in the South-west of Ireland who now raised store cattle which are bought by the large graziers of Roscommon and Galway. The Chief Secretary said "You must make up your mind between the cattle and the people." That phrase was a bit of mischievous and cheap rhetoric. If the soil and climate of a country favoured the rearing of cattle, then it was for the benefit of the people that the cattle should be reared. In England and the rest of the United Kingdom the same movement had been going on as in Ireland. Grazing was more and more taking the place of tillage. They did not go to the man who grazed his land in England and say: "You must make up your mind between the cattle and the people." It was, he thought, the most fallacious economic doctrine he had ever heard uttered in that House. There was nothing Irish farming needed so much as more tillage and less grazing; but he did not believe that they could substitute one system for the other off-hand. There was much confusion of thought in what had been said and written upon the subject of congestion. It seemed to be thought that all that was needed to turn an uneconomic into an economic holding was to add a few acres and put an uneconomic man on the land. The man and not the land was the really important factor in the case; and by giving an additional ten acres to be worked by an uneconomic man, who was incapable of working it, they would only aggravate the problem of congestion and not solve it. He had had before him cases—names of farmers and the character of the farms —in Galway in which lands had been divided and redistributed. Migration had here been carried out either by the Congested Districts Board or by the Land Commission, and in almost every instance the result so far had been that the men who were put upon the new holdings—migrated men who had got larger holdings which were now economic—had done one of two things. They had either sub-let them to graziers or let them for meadowing, and in this way they were making a profit rent by doing nothing. Formerly when they had uneconomic holdings they were hard working; but now they had simply taken to grazing, the thing they formerly denounced, and had become idlers. Having given a great deal of study to the question of migration, his feeling was that if migration was to be carried out—and he believed it must to some extent—they must proceed cautiously and experimentally and not in this large and wholesale manner. There must be a careful selection of the families to be migrated. The thing could not be done in the way proposed in the Majority Report of the Commission which the Government had followed in their Bill. The truth was they could not make a man a farmer by giving him a farm. He only wished he could have discovered in the Chief Secretary's able and interesting speech a greater sense of the enormous economic difficulties with which he was confronted if the scheme was to be carried out on sound principles.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he had listened with very great interest to the able speech of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge but, like many other speeches delivered from those benches that day, it was taken up chiefly with an exaggerated description of the difficulties facing those who undertook the problem. They were all aware of those difficulties, but was that any reason why the problem should not be dealt with? The hon. and learned Member had said that this proposal of the Government was like the proposal of some oriental despot who took whole populations and moved them against their will from one quarter of the country to the other. No, he would tell the hon. and learned Member who were like oriental despots: it was those men who drove those populations in the past to the position in which they were. The proposal of the Government was not as was described, a proposal to remove any man from his holding against his will. It was not enforced migration, it was voluntary migration, and when the hon. and learned Member stated that there were only 304 families which had migrated up to the present——

Mr. BUTCHER: Up to 1906.

Mr. DILLON said that fact had no significance unless they know how many were offered migration. He was informed by the hon. Member for Carlow that the evidence before the Commission was to the effect that the desire for migration was rapidly growing in the country where the people were beginning to understand what there was offered to them. He did not believe that that point was a serious difficulty at all. They had had migration in Ireland such as had been described by the hon. and learned Member in his imagination, but which were real in the past—migrations which forced unhappy people whom the Government were now trying to rescue, into the bogs and mountains of the west, where they had lived wretched though most industrious lives from that hour to this. In his own district large tracts of waste land which were given up to bogs and to game 100 years ago were now filled by the unhappy populations who were driven from the North of Ireland, from the county of Armagh, and who walked 100 miles to settle in the bogs and mountains of Mayo and of Galway, where they now formed the congested populations which were, without exception, the result of misgovernment in the past. They were driven there, and on the Government of this country, therefore, lay an obligation of honour and humanity to rescue them from the effects of this misconduct. Yet the hon. and learned Member took exception to an expression which was used by the Chief Secretary, an expression which, in his opinion, would ring from one end of Ireland to the other to-morrow, to the effect that it was the duty of the Government to take their choice between the people and the cattle. No more popular expression was ever used by an Irish Secretary. They heard a great deal of humbug talked about the danger to the cattle trade, but who thought of danger to the people when these lands were cleared for cattle in Ireland? He believed all this talk about the danger to the cattle trade was absolute nonsense, and the evidence given before the Royal Commission was all in the direction that there was no danger to the cattle, but that, on the contrary, the division of the grass lands in the West and also to a considerable extent in the Midlands, would result in a very great improvement and would increase the demand for cattle in Ireland. He had been listening for the last two years to the most doleful prophecies as to the ruin of the cattle trade by the cattle drivers. He wanted to draw attention to a remarkable fact which he had observed with his own eyes. They were all told that the cattle-drivers would destroy the cattle trade, and that the first people to suffer would be the small men in the West, who reared young stock. What had happened? That month the November fairs were held in Mayo, Sligo, and Galway, where these young cattle were, and it was the universal testimony of everybody who saw them that never in the last twenty-five years had there been such fairs in the West of Ireland, both as regards the supply of cattle, the demand, and the prices. The fairs were on a scale he had never witnessed. They were swept clear of cattle by ten o'clock in the morning. If that was the result of cattle-driving it had done no injury to the trade. The whole thing was a mere piece of cant and humbug. This delicate interest for the cattle trade and for the small stock raiser in the West of Ireland which had recently distinguished the landlord party in Ireland was the greatest cant. The cattle trade would not suffer if these grass ranches were divided. It would be improved, and even if it did suffer he was for the people as against the cattle trade. Why had this Bill become necessary? It was a great and comprehensive Bill, and he most heartily endorsed every word uttered in respect of it by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford. The first question the House was entitled to ask was why had it become necessary so soon after the Act of 1903. They had heard constantly the assertion that the Act of 1903 had been an unparalleled success. In one sense it had been an enormous success, because in five years nearly eighty millions' worth of land had been offered for sale. But that was only one aspect of the case. He was amazed to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover make the assertion that the Act was passed solely for the purpose of conveying from landlords to comfortable tenants in Ireland their holdings by direct sale.

*MR. WYNDHAM: No. I said it was confined to those who were occupiers of holdings. There were two objects: one, the sale of the holdings as occupied; the other the relief of congestion—that is, the improvement of existing holdings. But it did not contemplate bringing in new men.

MR. DILLON said that in 1903 the right hon. Gentleman said its greatest object was to relieve the poverty and misery of large districts in Ireland, to reconstruct the rotten and rigid communities in the West of Ireland; and the British Treasury of that day would never have consented to the bonus or to the terms contained in that Act, had it not been that the woes and the misery and the injustice of the condition of Connaught were paraded before the House and used as an argument for this treatment. The right hon. Gentleman had gone into elaborate figures to prove that the result of the Act had been that the best farms had been sold first and that the poor farms remained unsold to this hour. That was exactly what they had been saying for the last five years, and the Secretary for Ireland put his finger upon the point of the whole situation when he said the real truth was that those who ought to have been on top had been put at the bottom and those who ought to be at the bottom and could afford to wait had had the first place. That was one of the first causes of failure. The Act was put forward as a measure which would bring relief and generous relief to those rotten and rigid communities, as they were called, in the West of Ireland, and they all remembered that Mr. Ritchie, when the question of granting a bonus was in suspense, was put into a motor car and motored all round to the show places in Connaught and Galway to see the misery of the people. It was on that that Mr. Ritchie and the Treasury consented to give a bonus; and yet those people whose sufferings were used as a means to get good terms out of the Treasury had been left to this hour unrelieved, and in that respect the Act had been a tremendous failure. In another and a cognate case it had also been a failure. Here again he was amazed to hear the speech of the right hon. Gentleman.

He had said that in his opinion the breaking up of the grass ranches would be an act of economic insanity. The breaking up of the grass ranches was one of the great considerations on which he and his colleagues had agreed to the passing of the Act; and some who were discontented with some of the provisions of the Act were tempted to hold their tongues and be patient by the inducement that relief would be brought to the West of Ireland, that the grass lands were to be broken up, and that the evicted tenants would be promptly and generously reinstated. Every single one of these pledges had been broken, and while it was absolutely true to say in regard to the amount of land brought into the market the Act had been an enormous success, it was equally true to say that in regard to these three great matters, which to them were the chief recommendations of the Act, it had been a dismal failure, and that was the reason why it had been necessary to introduce an amending Bill. The success of an Irish Land Act might very fairly be judged, to some degree, by the extent to which it had brought peace and contentment to the country. Could any man who knew Ireland say the Act had brought peace and contentment to the country? According to hon. Gentlemen above the gangway Ireland was in a state of great uproar and discontent. There was another aspect of the failure. It was unreasonable to say that an Act like this had been a great success if its financial provisions were unsatisfactory. Some of them in 1903 tried to make their voices heard in protest against the financial provisions of the Act. He had always said they were vicious and would in all probability lead to a financial breakdown. The Bill was pushed through very rapidly and was not adequately discussed, and these financial provisions were slurred over by the eloquence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover. But there was no denying the fact that one of the sources of their trouble, and one of the causes which had made it necessary to introduce this Bill, was that the financial provisions had totally broken down. He expressed his obligation to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for one provision in this measure, and that was for relieving the Irish ratepayers. It was all very well to say it was nothing for this Bill to relieve the Irish ratepayers from their obligation under the Act of 1903. He entirely differed from that view because, supposing the Government let the Act of 1903 go on, what would be the result? They were bound as practical men to take into consideration this fact. If they simply went on and raised £10,000,000 a year from the money market the Treasury would have no choice. The whole loss would fall upon the Irish ratepayers, and it would amount to £10,000,000 or £15,000,000. It was a most valuable and necessary provision to relieve the Irish ratepayers from that loss. The provisions and alterations in the system of Irish land purchase introduced by the Act of 1903 were very far-reaching, and, in his opinion at the time, financially unsound. Up to 1903 Irish Land Act purchase paid its way, it was self-supporting, and under the Act of 1891 a sum of £200,000 had been accumulated, earned by the process of land purchase. But the Act of 1903 introduced a totally new system of finance. The annuity was reduced, the zone system and the bonus introduced, and all the changes made were for the sole purpose of inflating the price paid to the landlord. He had endeavoured to point out that when the Treasury was making sacrifices of that kind, and when these efforts were being made to increase the price given to the landlord, the Irish Members were entitled to some *quid pro quo*, and one of the great objections which he had to the financial system of the Act was that they got no *quid pro quo*. What had been the effect of these provisions? He wanted to direct the attention of the House to the most interesting Report of the Estates Commissioners on this point. They gave an exceedingly valuable and interesting table of the prices of Irish land for the five years preceding the Act of 1903, calculated first in stock and then in cash, because at that time the landlords were paid in stock which had appreciated. He would give only the cash price—the average price in years purchase of land throughout Ireland, taking all classes of rents. The number of years purchase in stock were in 1899 18·0;

in 1900 18·2; in 1901 18·3; in 1902 18·0; and in 1903 18·2. The number of years purchase in cash was in 1899, 19·4; 1900, 19·1; 1901, 18·0; 1902, 16·8; 1903, 17·0. Hon. Members must remember that in each of those successive years the number of second-term rents which came into calculation was increased, and it should be observed that during the five years preceding 1903 the price of Irish land was rapidly falling in the market, and it fell in those five years from 19·4 in 1899 to seventeen years purchase in the year 1903. What was the effect in the year 1903? The Estates Commissioners Report stated—

> "It will be observed that the average number of years purchase calculated in land stock, for the five years preceding the passing of the Land Act of 1903 was 18·0; that during the years 1899 and 1900, when land stock was ordinarily above par, the number of years purchase calculated in cash was somewhat over nineteen; and that during the two years immediately preceding the passing of the Act of 1903, when land stock was below par, the average number of years purchase calculated in cash was about seventeen. The average number of years purchase paid in the case of sales by landlords direct to tenants for holding the purchase-money, which was advanced in period ended 31st March, 1906, is 22·9, which, with the bonus, is equivalent to over twenty-five and a half years purchase to the vendor, an increase of somewhat over 40 per cent. on prices obtained in the preceding five years, or of 50 per cent. on prices obtained during the two years immediately preceding the passing of the Act. The average rates per acre paid for all classes for holdings sold by landlords direct to tenants under Land Purchase Acts before and since the passing of the Irish Land Act, 1903, were as follows: Act of 1885, £10 8s. (cash); Acts of 1891–1896, £9 2s. (stock); Act of 1903 (to 31st March, 1906), £13 4s. (cash). The average rate per acre paid during the five years immediately preceding the passing of the Act for holdings sold by landlords direct to tenants was £8 9s. (stock), when no bonus was payable, as against £13 4s. (cash) paid under the Act of 1903, exclusive of bonus, which, with the bonus, would realise for the landlord £15 per acre. This figure compared with the prices previously paid shows an increase in the price per acre received by landlords of 68·5 per cent."

That was the result of the finance of the 1903 Act. In his opinion that result went far beyond anything which the House of Commons intended. When they were arriving at a final agreement in regard to the Act of 1903 he recollected stating himself that if the landlords were content to accept the average prices which they had got for their land before the Act was passed, he was willing to give them the whole bonus, although many people thought it ought to be divided between the tenant and the landlord. Now they were assured that a new spirit of moderation had come into the minds of the Irish landlords, and that they were willing to come to reasonable terms all round. He should be very glad if he could believe that, but he was bound to say that the resolutions passed at their Dublin Convention did not look like reconciliation. One of those resolutions condemned the Government

> "For wasting time and money on reinstating evicted tenants which ought to have been devoted to promoting land purchase; they regarded the proposal for dealing with the West of Ireland on the lines of the Dudley Commission Report as an outrageous proposal calculated to interrupt the whole process of land purchase; and furthermore that the Land Commissioners were carrying out a system of confiscation by their excessive reductions of rent."

That did not look very much like conciliation or agreement upon a common basis. He had no desire to introduce any obstacles to conciliation or to land purchase, and he was in favour of acting in a spirit of give and take. It must not, however, be a policy of all give and no take. He was perfectly prepared to consider any proposals the landlords had to make in a spirit of reason, of friendliness, and of give and take, but, for himself he would not consent to being any party to an arrangement by which the landlords could walk off with their plunder and leave the tenants in the ditch. He could see quite clearly what was at the bottom of the landlords' mind. They grudged the £250,000 a year which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had generously offered to the Congested Districts Board; they would like to see it turned into their own pockets. They had no peace on those terms. He might tell the landlords that they would not get that £250,000 to swell the prices which were already high enough. He wished to allude to one subject which was the cause of a great deal of debate upon the Bill of 1903. In that discussion he protested against the zone system as an abominable invention which in his judgment had wrought untold mischief in Ireland. He was told at the time that the zones would not affect the county he represented, or apply to congested districts. At that time he stated that in his judgment the zones would have more effect in raising the price of land in the poor districts than in the rich districts, and that was what had actually happened. What had been the result in his own division? Before the passing of the Act of 1903 the normal price of land was fourteen years purchase of the rent; but since that time it had risen to twenty-three years purchase. Therefore it was no use telling him that the zones did not apply to his county. His unfortunate people were in arrears of rent, and the landlords would not sell to them unless they consented to twenty-two years purchase, and if they refused they were served with writs and processes for arrears of rent. This unhappy system of zones had deprived the poor class of tenant of the protection of inspection for value, which in the past had been most effective, because it often cut down the price which the tenant had agreed to pay under coercion and terror. Under this system of zones the price of land had been raised all over Ireland to twenty-three and twenty-four years purchase, with the consequence that in the western districts purchase had come to a deadlock and the whole of the money which they were led to suppose would relieve those districts had gone to the Duke of Leinster and other landlords in the southern districts, and the poorer districts had been left out in the cold. With regard to the zones, the land of Ireland was perfectly good security, but in the case of some of the western estates he admitted the security was not so good. He wished to point out, however, that the Treasury incurred no risk in this matter, because any loss would be made good by the charge upon the ratepayers in Ireland. Consequently those who represented Ireland were entitled to see that the ratepayers did not incur any unnecessary risk in the terms agreed upon. He wished to read one passage which was of extreme value upon this question of security. Although he was sorry that the Government had not seen its way to sweep away zones altogether, the proposal made by the Chief Secretary was to a large extent a satisfactory method, because the Estates Commissioners had power, whenever they had any good reason for suspecting there had been duress or heavy arrears or insufficient security, to take the case outside the zones. The Fry Commission, the *personnel* of which was entirely appointed by the Tory Government in response to the landlords of Ireland, in their Report said—

> "In our opinion the practice of the Department has been over-strict in the matter of security, and applications to the Department have been thereby discouraged. . . . We are further of opinion that where the purchase is made within a fixed period, say five years from the fixing of a fair rent, and the purchase money does not exceed, say, eighteen years purchase of the fair rent, that price ought to be accepted by the purchase Department as the sum to be advanced by the State, without inspection, except to the extent of ascertaining that the purchasers are the actual occupiers."

That was the high-water mark under their own agreements when the fair purchase price was not more than eighteen years, and the fair rent was fixed within five years. That was the second term rental. They had now departed from that, and the landlords insisted that where the purchase was twenty-six or twenty-seven years there should be no inspection. He heartily thanked the Chief Secretary for the courage he had shown in bringing forward this measure. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stick to his guns. He thought the Irish landlords would be badly advised if they did not give the Bill fair consideration.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): The hon. Member for East Mayo has declared that the landlords have pronounced against this Bill, and especially in regard to the grant of £250,000, because, as he was good enough to say, it would not go into their own pockets. There have been only three speakers who can, by any possible effort of imagination, be held to speak for the Irish landlords, namely—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, the hon. Member for North Armagh, and the hon. Member for Cambridge University. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, in referring to the extra grant, not only did not criticise it, but, on the contrary, while he safeguarded himself by saying that he might have something to say about the way in which it was to be spent, he had no objection to offer to the extra grant to be made by the Exchequer to the Congested Districts Board. The hon. Member for Cambridge took a similar line, and where the hon. Member for East Mayo found ground for the proposition that the landlords object to the proposal of this special grant, I do not know. If the hon. Member desires, as he told us he did, a conciliatory and friendly consideration of the Bill from the landlords, he took the worst possible step to secure that end. I have listened to the whole of the debate, as I have listened to many previous debates on the Irish land question, and I have often asked myself: Does the House realise what it is asked to do, and do the Government realise the effect of their proposals? What is the ultimate object of this measure? Do the Government intend to go on with it to the Second Reading and subsequent stages, and, if so, when do they propose to take it? The speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford was an indication of his views. I do not suggest anything in the form of an alliance, or even friendship, between the two benches, but the hon. Member indicated that it would be satisfactory to him if the Bill were included in a suspensory Motion. The discussion has been an indication to the Chief Secretary that he has somewhat rashly and without consideration embarked unnecessarily on a very thorny path. The right hon. Gentleman has said that the three objects that he set himself to solve were the block in the working of the Land Act owing to financial reasons, the removal of congestion, and the necessary Amendments to the Land Act to make it effective for all purposes. The hon. Member for East Mayo has told us that in all the negotiations that took place both in the Conference that preceded the passage of the Land Act of 1903, and during the passage of that Act, the governing principle was the removal of congestion. I know nothing of what took place at the Conference, but I know what took place in this House. and I say that what took place here in that year was the result of what took place at the previous Conference. I have read the debates recently, and I venture to say that the idea of the Government and the governing principle with the Government, was not the relieving of congestion, but the transfer of the land from the owners to the occupiers, and not upon the ground put by the hon. Member for East Mayo—not because this House was moved by the terrible stories of Irish congestion, suffering, and misery. We have heard of that, and those who have studied this question know of and deplore the fact that there is great foundation for the statements in regard to the misery of a large portion of people who live in the congested districts. But that was not the cause that led to the acceptance by this House of the Act of 1903. What was it? It was in the first place that this House had deliberately established the principle of dual ownership. Consequently when various Land Acts had failed to transfer the land from the owners to the occupiers with sufficient rapidity there was at that time an entire block. In consequence of the block there was a demand for compulsion. The conference was the answer to that demand, and the Act of 1903 was the result of the Conference, and the condition of things then existing. When the hon. Member for East Mayo said that the right hon. Member for Dover took Mr. Ritchie, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, through the congested districts and moved him to assent, as Chancellor, to the passage of the Bill, he did a grave injustice both to the memory of Lord Ritchie and to the action of my right hon. friend. What are the Government doing to remove the block? The main object of our coming here to-night is to hear their announcement. They admit that the block is caused by the want of money. What is there in the proposals of the Government dealing with the main question of finance which is going to advance by a single inch the position of those purchasing holdings in Ireland? I tried to the best of my ability to follow the financial statement of the Chief Secretary. As I understand, what he proposes to do is by a sum limited to £5,000,000 per annum to deal with the matter. The proposal of the Chief Secretary fails altogether to meet the proposition laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover at the time the Act was passed, and again this afternoon. In his speech this afternoon, my right hon. friend, speaking not only as the author of the Act of 1903, but for his colleagues, said that whatever was done in regard to the finance of the Land Purchase Acts, there were two things which were essential. One was that the present block should be removed by easing the finance, and the other was that nothing should be done to prejudice the position of those who come after. I venture to say that in the Government proposals there is nothing which will by one 6d. or by one second expedite the purchase of land by the occupiers from the owners. What about those who come afterwards? The Chief Secretary has based the whole of his proposal on the fact—I will not say the fact, but upon the suggestion that the figures of my right hon. friend were arrived at upon information obtained in the ordinary way, and that those estimates were wrong. The Chief Secretary told us that we are to have a paper a little later by which we shall be able to ascertain how his calculations were arrived at; I venture to say that that Paper ought to have been laid on the Table at the time this Bill was introduced. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover did not base his calculations on estimates, but he took the figures which were available. I do not believe that the Chief Secretary realises that this is not an Amendment of the Act of 1903. This is not to remove certain blots in that Act. The proposal of the Government means practically the repeal of the Act of 1903. Perhaps I am mis-stating the case when I say repeal, but it means the carrying of a new Act of Parliament for a different object, or else the calculations of the Government on which the whole of this matter rests are ill-founded. We shall wait for the Paper which the Chief Secretary says he is going to produce. The debate has produced abundant evidence that behind this proposal there is an intention to upset a great part of the policy of 1903. The Chief Secretary had appealed to Lord MacDonnell's Report. I have read that Report with great care, and I can only say that I was amazed that the Government in shaping their proposals have not shown more respect for it. They have adopted wholesale the Report of the majority of the Dudley Commission without regard to the weighty criticisms made by Lord MacDonnell as a result of his very considerable experience of Dublin Castle. The Chief Secretary used a phrase with reference to cattle-driving which, I think, he will regret, although the hon. Member for Mayo welcomed his words with cheers. I listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Mayo, and so far as I was able to follow him it appears that he believes that the more cattle-driving you have the more likely is the cattle trade to prosper. The particular phrase used by the Chief Secretary was: "You have to choose between the cattle and the people." That may be a very pleasant catch-phrase for the Chief Secretary to use, who is fond of humour and of remarks that are likely to tickle the fancy of those who listen to him; but I venture to say that it was an unfortunate phrase for any Minister to use, above all a Minister in the very difficult position occupied by the Chief Secretary in Ireland, to whatever party he belongs. The hon. Gentleman knows well that cattle-driving is going on and that he has been unable to stop it. I do not know if he has taken the proper means. What then does he mean by saying: "We must choose between the cattle and the people"? Did he hear the speech of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, who told us that we should find in the Reports two sides of the question regarding the change of the grazing land into arable land? With regard to this cattle question there is one fact which nobody can deny, and that is, that the cattle industry is by far the greatest, most prosperous, and most valuable in money of any industry in Ireland. [Cries of "Oh, oh!" from the IRISH Benches.] That is undoubtedly the case.

MR. KETTLE: That is not so.

MR. WALTER LONG: Well, I believe that to be the case. I do not mean to exaggerate and say it is one of the most valuable industries in Ireland so far as agriculture is concerned. What is the suggestion of the Government? You are not to amend the Land Act of 1903 so as to relieve congestion, but to take land which it was never contemplated, when that Act was passed, would be offered for purchase at all, and use that land for the purpose of relieving congestion. This brings us to an entirely new development of the land question. And do not let hon. Gentlemen opposite, who do not represent Irish constituencies, and who will vote cheerfully for the Bill, forget that they are taking a step along a fresh path which they cannot retrace. If it be right to use the machinery of the Land Act of 1903 to take the grazing lands of Roscommon and Galway and to migrate to them people from the West of Ireland—grazing lands which are held by people who are using them to their own advantage and carrying on a prosperous industry to the advantage of the country—then, I ask, are the Radical supporters of the Government opposite prepared to allow a similar extraordinary change to be made in England? Are they prepared to propose to break up the grass land of Gloucestershire and Leicestershire in order to settle on them the congested population of some of the large towns of England? If it is sound policy to break up the great ranches in Ireland for this particular purpose it is equally sound to apply the same principle to England and to the grazing parts of Scotland. I am not discussing now whether the policy is right or wrong —I think it is wrong—but whether right or wrong, you are taking a step to-night which is altogether a fresh departure so far as the Act of 1903 is concerned; and taking a step which carries with it immense responsibilities. The Chief Secretary told us that judging by the figures given before the Dudley Commission, and by the Report itself, as well as by the Minority Report of Sir John Colomb, he believed that the balance was in favour of an improved revenue being derived from cultivation over the cattle business. And the right hon. Gentleman went on to indicate that he was a believer in the policy of the land now held for grazing purposes only being held as small holdings for mixed husbandry. I say that the Government are deliberately flying in the face of every particle of evidence and experience. In the first place, I do not believe that there is any evidence worth reading which shows that arable farming and grazing of cattle can be successfully carried on unless on large farms. Under present conditions if you break up these grazing lands for the purpose of growing cereals, is it likely that you are going to make it a success? If you alter the existing system you must educate the farmers to make a living by a system which has been abandoned in other parts of the country. I say that this is a question which is open to debate, and there is a great deal of evidence against breaking up the grass lands, and it is a monstrous thing to declare that the only alternative lies between the cattle and the people. It will only do the greatest cruelty and the greatest injustice to the people, and it will be used in Ireland in a very different sense from what the right hon. Gentleman used it in this House. I have only one more word to say. The hon. Member for Mayo told us that the Act of 1903 was ill-considered and insufficiently discussed. Well, that Act was mainly a financial proposal to facilitate the transfer of land from one owner to another and involved no new principle. This Bill is a Bill which raises a dozen novel principles; it touches three great questions, each separate and distinct, and each one of which ought to form the subject of a separate measure. It is brought in at the end of November when we have more than enough work to engage our attention to the middle of next year. I do not for a moment suggest that the Chief Secretary has acted in bad faith with regard to it by bringing it in now, but it is impossible for me to regard it as a really business-like and practical proposal which the House is asked to discuss with a view of its passing into law within a reasonable time. A Bill of this kind ought to have been introduced weeks ago in order to have a fairer and better opportunity of its consideration and discussion. So far as we are concerned we shall be only too glad to deal with anything to relieve congestion and facilitate purchase, but the Government are making a mistake in bringing in a comprehensive measure of this kind at the fag end of an autumn session.

MR. BIRRELL: I should like to say that this Bill which I ask leave of the House to introduce is by no means a sham Bill. It is a Bill which we mean to prosecute, after listening to the criticisms which we may anticipate getting from all quarters, to the very best of our ability. I will do my very utmost to secure that it receives a Second Reading in this House at the earliest possible moment, and, so far from having a desire to drop it, that will be the last notion to enter into my mind. It is impossible to forecast the session, but, if any Bills are carried over, I certainly will not continue to occupy the position I hold unless this Bill is one of them.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): When will the Second Reading be taken?

MR. BIRRELL: At the very earliest possible moment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Birrell, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, and Mr. T. W. Russell.

Mr. Birrell.

IRISH LAND BILL.

"To Amend the Law relating to the occupation and ownership of Land in Ireland, and for other purposes relating thereto," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 378].

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House of 31st July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

[APPENDICES

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXCVI.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Children	*Earl Beauchamp*	Report 12th Nov. (458)
*Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	Third Reading 18th Nov (1192) Read 3ª and passed 19th Nov. (1353)
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press)	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Report 17th Nov. (1010)
*Licensing	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1ª 20th Nov. (1596)
Nurses Registration [H.L.]	*Lord Ampthill*	Read 3ª and passed 10th Nov. (4)
Post Office (Consolidation)	*Lord Chancellor*	Committee 19th Nov. (1360) Report 23rd Nov. (1743)

(B) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Companies Consolidation [H.L.]	*Sir H. Kearley*	Read 1° 17th Nov. (1073)
*Constabulary (Ireland)	*Mr. Birrell*	Read 1° 19th Nov. (1554)
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Report 10th Nov. (59)
*Elementary Education (England & Wales) (No. 2)	*Mr. Runciman*	Read 1° 20th Nov. (1578)

(B.) House of Commons—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Irish Land	*Mr. Birrell*	Read 1° 23rd Nov. (1806)
*Local Government (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 2° 23rd Nov. (1916) Report 13th Nov. (727)
*Licensing	*Mr. Asquith*	Report 16th Nov. (893) Report 17th Nov. (1073) Report 18th Nov. (1232) Report 19th Nov. (1436) Read 3° and passed 20th Nov. (1578)
Nurses Registration [H.L.]	*Mr. Munro Ferguson*	Read 1° 17th Nov. (1078)
*Port of London	*Mr. Lloyd George*	Committee 11th Nov. (321) Committee 12th Nov. (567) (645)
*Post Office Savings Bank (Public Trustee)	*Mr. S. Buxton*	Read 1° 17th Nov. (1073)
Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland)	*Mr. T. Shaw*	Read 2° 19th Nov. (1553)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

NOVEMBER 10—23.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abercorn Estate
  Case of S. Keys.
    Q. Mr. C. MacVeigh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 854.

Aberdare
  Evans, D., Case of.
    Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11*, 271.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]
  Leader Estate—Case of Mrs. A. Nagle' *Nov. 12*, 558.
  Lunatic Pensioners, Position of, *Nov. 23*, 1800.
  Old-Age Pensions — Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 19*, 1386.
  Sherlock Estate, Inspection of Evicted Tenant's late Holding, *Nov. 12*, 558.
  Wallis Estate—Case of T. J. O'Keeffe, *Nov. 19*, 1424.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1265–1267.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 212.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
  Financial Secretary—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.

Admiralty—*cont.*
  Contracts [*See also Names of Articles*]
    British Articles, Purchase of.
      Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
    White, Messrs. J. S., Number placed with.
      Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 262.
  First Sea Lord, Pay of.
    Q. Mr. Du Cros; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 16*, 853.
  Granite Contracts.
    Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1030.
  Liquor Contracts.
    Qs. Mr. L. Harris, Mr. H. C. Lea, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 12*, 520.
  Timber Contracts — Method of Calling for Tenders.
    Q. Earl of Ronaldshay; *A.* Dr. Macnamara, *Nov. 12*, 507.

Africa, East
  [*For Particular Places see their Names, as Uganda, etc.*]
  Mombassa Mail Service by British India Company.
    Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 542.

Africa, West
[*For Particular Provinces, etc., see their Names, as* Nigeria.]
Brass
Export and Import Statistics.
Q. Mr. Armitage; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 265.
Specie Imports (1906–7).
Q. Mr. Armitage; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 265.
Spirit Imports in 1907.
Qs. Mr. Armitage; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 263.
Firearm Importation, Protocol as to Prohibition, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1017; *Nov. 18*, 1186.

"Agnes Donohoe"
Compensation Claim.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 19*, 1400.

Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill
Facilities for.
Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 560.

Agriculture and Fisheries Board
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1362; *Nov. 23*, 1678.
Diseases, Co-operation between Great Britain and Ireland in dealing with.
Q. Mr. Stanier; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1794.
Tropical Bureau, Establishment of.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 10*, 37.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.
Carroll, Mr., Qualifications of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 19*, 1367.
Cattle and Horse-Breeding Schemes in Ireland, Assistance to.
Qs. Mr. E. Davies, Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 17*, 1062.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Workhouse Labour Test, *Nov. 23*, 1786.

Algeria
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 11*, 213.

Aliens Act
Administration—making more Strict, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 870.
Passenger Traffic and Expulsion Orders—Returns Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Christchurch Sewerage Scheme, *Nov. 16*, 849.

Allendale, Lord
Local Authorities [Admission of the Press] Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 17*, 1012, 1014.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice.*
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 458, 459, 465, 468, 471, 485, 490.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Old-Age Pensions—Facilities for Ascertaining Age, *Nov. 19*, 1428.

Ampthill, Lord
Army, Organisation of, as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1719.
Nurses Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 10–16.

Angola
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Education Bill—Government Proposals for effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1435.
Education [Scotland] Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 111, 120, 168, 184, 185, 192.
Old-Age Pension Regulations
Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1564.
Arrangements for Tabling and Discussing, *Nov. 19*, 1564, 1565.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
Morocco—Postal Cash-on-Delivery System, Facilities for, *Nov. 18*, 1215.

Anthrax
Precautions against Importation.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 11*, 250.

Antrim
Orange Lodges in the South.
Qs. Mr. Joyce, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 12*, 552.

Armaments
Expenditure on, by Great Britain and Foreign Powers.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1430.

Armitage, Mr. R. [Leeds, Central]
Africa, West
Brass
Export and Import Statistics, *Nov. 11*, 265.
Specie Imports (1906–7), *Nov. 11*, 265.
Spirit Imports in 1907, *Nov. 11*, 263.

[*cont.*

Armitage, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Gold Coast Colony—Railway Rates on Spirits, *Nov. 11*, 263.
Niger Delta—Payment of Fines and Currency used, *Nov. 11*, 264.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Barracks—One-room Married Quarters in Occupation.
Q Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 864.
Carlow Barracks, Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 863.
Cork Barracks—Discharge of Artisans and Labourers.
Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 11*, 258; *Nov. 18*, 1231.
Curragh Camp
Beresford Barracks, Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Ashley, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 864.
Officers' Quarters.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 863.
Quarters for Army Service Corps.
Qs. Mr. A. S. Wilson, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 10*, 36.
Guns, One-pounder Quick-firing in Use.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 11*, 250.
Headquarters Staff—Revision proposed.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 23*, 1769.
Horses
Remount Department, Excess in.
Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
Welsh Purchases.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 10*, 34.
Irish Command—Constitution of Sixth Division.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 864.
Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*
Officers—Examination of Candidates for Commissions.
Q. Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 10*, 36.
Organisation of as a Means of Defence.
Os. Earl Roberts, *Nov. 23*, 1679, Earl of Cromer, 1706; Viscount Midleton, 1711–1714; Earl of Crewe, 1719, 1736, 1737; Lord Ampthill, 1719; Lord Grenfell, 1726–1729; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1734, 1735.

Army—*cont.*
Parkhurst Barracks, Baths in.
Qs. Captain Clive; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 18*, 1212.
Recruiting
Character and Quality of Men Recruited.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Nov. 16*, 820, 821, 829, 834, 835; Lord Haversham, 828; Lord Saye and Sele, 829; Lord Lucas, 830.
Report of Inspector-General.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Nov. 16*, 818, 820.
Reserve Residing Abroad, Statistics as to.
Q. Major Renton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 19*, 1381.
Soldiers
Civil Employment on Discharge.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Nov. 16*, 823.
Consumptive, Government Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 11*, 296.
Trades, Teaching of—Recommendations of Committee, etc.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Nov. 16*, 818, 825–827, 832, 837; Lord Haversham, 828, 829; Lord Lucas, 830–832; Viscount Midleton, 832–834; Earl of Erroll, 837.
Special Reserve
Enlistment Statistics.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 12*, 516.
Officers, Employment of.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 23*, 1755.
Suffolk Regiment, Third Battalion, Training of.
Qs. Mr. H. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 23*, 1770.
Territorial Force
Home Defence, Employment for.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *Nov. 16*, 822, 835, 836; Lord Lucas, 830, 835.
Horses Available, Reports on.
Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
Infantry Armourer-Sergeants, Pay of.
Q. Mr. C. Grant; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 12*, 515.
Medals, Grant for.
Q. Sir F. Leyland-Barratt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 19*, 1337.
Permanent Staff
Re-posting to Regiments—Powers of Commanding Officers.
Os. Earl of Dartmouth, *Nov. 16*, 811–813, 816, 817; Lord Lucas, 814–817; Lord Saye and Sele, 817; Marquess of Salisbury, 817.

[cont.

Army—*cont.*
Permanent Staff—*cont*
Reduction in Number of.
Os. Earl of Dartmouth, *Nov. 16*, 810; Lord Lucas, 813, 814.
Shooting, Prizes for.
Q. Colonel Long; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 19*, 1387.
Shooting Ranges in Scotland, Caretakers of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 19*, 1381.
Special Reserve, *see that Subheading*
Uniform Provided.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 11*, 259.
Value of as a Fighting Force.
Os. Earl Roberts, *Nov. 23*, 1681, 1682, 1692, 1693; Viscount Midleton, 1712; Lord Grenfell, 1725; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1734; Viscount Milner, 1740.
War Office, *see that title.*
Wiltshire, Private A., Case of.
Qs. Sir I. Herbert; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 23*, 1770.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
Navy
Rosyth Works, Date of Completing, *Nov. 16*, 857, 858.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Contract Speed, *Nov. 16*, 855, 856.

Ashbourne, Lord
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 489.
Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1193, 1195; *Nov. 19*, 1354, 1355, 1359.
Post Office Consolidation Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 19*, 1360.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
Army
Barracks—One-room Married Quarters in Occupation, *Nov. 16*, 864.
Carlow Barracks, Condition of, *Nov. 16*, 863.
Curragh Camp
Beresford Barracks, Condition of, *Nov. 16*, 864, 865.
Officers' Quarters, *Nov. 16*, 863.
Quarters for Army Service Corps, *Nov. 10*, 36.
Irish Command—Constitution of Sixth Division, *Nov. 16*, 864.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 186, 201.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Fifeshire, E.]
Afforestation Commission Report, Date of presenting, *Nov. 10*, 57.
Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill, Facilities for, *Nov. 12*, 560.
Autumn Session, Duration of, *Nov. 16*, 891.
Beer—Legislative Proposals as to Hop Substitutes, *Nov. 19*, 1430.
Bills—Carrying over to next Session, Suggestion for, *Nov. 17*, 1070.
Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 19*, 1435, 1436.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 23*, 1803.
Constabulary—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 890.
Consumptive Soldiers, Government Proposals as to, *Nov. 11*, 297.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill
Amendments, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16*, 891; *Nov. 17*, 1071.
Proposals as to, *Nov. 12*, 561, 562; *Nov. 23*, 1804–6.
Settlement, Government Proposals for Effecting, *Nov. 19*, 1433, 1434, 1435.
Education (Scotland) Bill—Report and Third Reading Stages, Allocation of Time for, *Nov. 10*, 58; *Nov. 16*, 892.
Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Discussion of, *Nov. 19*, 1429.
Housing and Town Planning Bill—Legal Attendance at Proceedings, *Nov. 17*, 1072; *Nov. 23*, 1802, 1803.
Land Purchase
Fund, Proposals as to, *Nov. 19*, 1432.
Present Position—Effect of projected Legislation, *Nov. 16*, 889, 890.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 743–745, 787–789; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1578–1594.
Clubs—Government Amendments proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1070.
Inn-keepers' Duties, Definition of, *Nov. 16*, 893; *Nov. 19*, 1431, 1432.
Meal, Definition of, *Nov. 19*, 1432.
Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 301–308, 320.
Subsection (2) of New Clause, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16*, 893.
Tied Houses, Proposals for Abolishing, *Nov. 12*, 560.
Navy
Expenditure—International Reduction proposed, *Nov. 16*, 861, 862.
Rosyth Works Loan, Issue of, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1071.
Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 16*, 862.

cont.

Asquith, Rt. Hon H. H.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Two-power Standard, Definition of, *Nov. 12*, 560; *Nov. 16*, 862; *Nov. 23*, 1768, 1769.
North British Railway Company Employees, Civil Rights of, *Nov. 17*, 1072.
Port of London Bill
Clause 3, Hour for taking, *Nov. 11*, 298.
Discussion of, *Nov. 12*, 562.
Late Sittings, Objection to, *Nov. 12*, 562.
Roads—Government Proposals, *Nov. 19*, 1430.
Small Holdings—Dismissal of Applicants by Employers, Cases of, *Nov. 11*, 297.
Small Holdings Act, 1892, Amendment Bill, Facilities for, *Nov. 12*, 561.
Stipendiary Curates
Position of, in Convocation, *Nov. 16*, 892.
Tenure of Office, *Nov. 23*, 1803.
Superannuation — Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 23*, 1802.
Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 19*, 1429.
Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill, Scope of, *Nov. 17*, 1069.
Unemployment
Poor Relief—Terms of Local Government Board Order, *Nov. 12*, 540, 643.
Voluntary Committees, Grant to, *Nov. 11*, 296.
Warlike Expenditure—Comparison with certain Nations, *Nov. 19*, 1430.

Athenry
Eviction on 2nd inst.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 555.

Atkinson, Lord
Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1193, 1194; *Nov. 19*, 1354, 1356.
Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill — Dispensing with Standing Order XXXVIII., *Nov. 17*, 1010.

Attorney-General—*Sir W. S. Robson*

Attorney-General for Ireland — *Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry*

Australia
[*See also Names of States.*]
Naval Defence Proposals.
Qs. Earl Winterton, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 16*, 860.

Autumn Session
Duration of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 891.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1332; *Nov. 19*, 1528.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [City of London]
Admiralty Liquor Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 522.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 12*, 562; *Nov. 23*, 1804, 1806.
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1813.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 784–787; *Nov. 16*, 907, 924–935, 938, 939; *Nov. 17*, 1120–1128, 1130, 1134.
Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 307–313.
Tied Houses, Proposals for Abolishing, *Nov. 12*, 560.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 329–332.
Discussion of, *Nov. 12*, 562.
Late Sittings, Objection to, *Nov. 12*, 562.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Bills, Precedence for—Suspension of Standing Order No. XXI., *Nov. 18*, 1186–1188, 1191.
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 497, 498.
Moray Firth, Trawling in
British Vessels Prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 229–235.
Bye-laws, Operation of, *Nov. 11*, 228, 234.
Foreign Trawlers, Policy as to, *Nov 11*, 233.
Line-fisheries, Damage done to, *Nov. 11*, 232.
Nurses Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 5–8, 12.

Ballinacurra
Sewerage Scheme.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 294.

Ballinameen
Cattle-drive on Mr. J. Robinson's Farm.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1065.

Ballybricken Fair
Assaults on D. Heylin.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 555.

Ballyglass
Cattle-drive on 8th inst.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1064.

Ballyshannon
Postal Facilities.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 502; *Nov. 23*, 1746.

Ballyvourney
Case of W. Sheehan.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Banbury, Sir F. [City of London]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 118, 119, 153, 162, 173, 190.
Investments Abroad—Estimate (1900–7), *Nov. 12*, 538.
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1884–1890.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 798; *Nov. 18*, 1266–1271; *Nov. 19*, 1494–1496, 1501, 1526–1528, 1531.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 638, 679, 698, 700.

Bank of England
Notes issued—Return Presented, *Nov. 16*, 839; *Nov. 17*, 1010.
Notes issued for more than Forty Years, System of Writing-off.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23*, 1776.

Barbados
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 838.

Barker, Sir J. [Penryn and Falmouth]
Beer Ingredients, List of, *Nov. 10*, 23, 49.

Barlow, Mr. P. [Bedford]
Petrol Storage—Prevention of Accidents, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
Beer
Brewers Paying Duty on less than 500 Barrels, *Nov. 11*, 254.
Licensed Holders Brewing and Selling their own Beer, *Nov. 11*, 254.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 903–905, 940, 941; *Nov. 17*, 1100-1105, 1109, 1129, 1133, ; *Nov. 19*, 1446–1451.
Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 313–315.
Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 10*, 42.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 350, 420, 427, 444, 445, 454; *Nov. 12*, 651

Barnes, Mr. G. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 144–146, 156, 203.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Canada—Appointment of British Trade Correspondents, *Nov. 11*, 276, 277.
Constabulary—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 288.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*' 161.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 648.

Barrow-in-Furness
Distress Committee, Application from.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 875.

Bastardy Laws
Amendment proposed.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Burns' *Nov. 19*, 1369.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1758.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1783.

Beach, Mr. M. H. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]
Foot and Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Nov. 19*, 1411.
Gloucestershire Small Holdings Returns, *Nov. 19*, 1410.
Old-Age Pensions.
Committees, Formation of, *Nov. 23*, 1761.
Regulations—Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1565.

Beauchamp, Earl—*Lord Steward*
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 458, 459, 460, 462, 467, 469, 471, 472, 474, 479, 481, 483, 484, 493, 496, 499.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
Sussex Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1219.
Unemployment Grant, Conditions of Making Payments from, *Nov. 17*, 1024.

Beck, Mr. A. C. [Cambridge, Wisbech]
Colonial Securities—Facilities for Small Investors, *Nov. 10*, 48.

Beer
Brewers Paying Duty on less than 500 Barrels.
Q. Mr. Barnard; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 11*, 254.
Hop-Substitutes, Legislative Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1430.
Ingredients, List of.
Q. Sir J. Barker; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 10*, 23.
Q. Sir J. Barker; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 49.

[*cont.*

Beer—*cont.*
- Licensed Holders Brewing and Selling their own Beer.
  - *Q.* Mr. Barnard; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 11*, 254.

Belgium
- Colonial Minister, Identity of
  - *Qs.* Earl of Ronaldshay, Mr. Belloc; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 38.

Belhaven and Stenton, Lord
- Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 467.

Bell Rock
- Trawling in Vicinity.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 13*, 713.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
- Navy
  - Channel Fleet—Strength on 23rd September, *Nov. 12*, 524.
  - Torpedo-boat Destroyers—Contract Speed, *Nov. 16*, 855, 856.
- Navy Estimates—Votes in United Kingdom and Certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 16*, 859.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
- Belgian Colonial Minister, Identity of, *Nov. 10*, 39.
- Doolin Disturbance on 18th ult., *Nov. 16*, 887.
- Education Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 23*, 1806.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 797.
- Riverstown Disturbance on 29th ult., *Nov. 19*, 1417; *Nov. 23*, 1796.

Belper, Lord
- Local Authorities [Admission of the Press] Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 17*, 1013, 1015.

Benn, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 412–414.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
- Small Holdings
  - Expenses, Definition of, *Nov. 18*, 1222.
  - Houses and Buildings, Schemes for, *Nov. 18*, 1218.
  - Register of Applications proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1222.
  - Reports on Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1221.

Berkshire
- Charities—Return Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1745.

Bertram, Mr. J. [Hertfordshire, Hitchin]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1092–1094, 1114.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burghs]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 797.

Bills
- Carrying over to next Session, Suggestion for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Henry; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1069.
- Precedence for—Suspension of Standing Order No. XXI.
  - *Os.* Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Nov. 18*, 1186–1188, 1191; Earl of Crewe, 1189; Marquess of Londonderry, 1190; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1190, 1191.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
- Abercorn Estate—Case of S. Keys, *Nov. 16*, 854.
- Athenry Eviction on 2nd inst., *Nov. 12*, 555.
- Ballincurra Sewerage Scheme, *Nov. 11*, 295.
- Ballinameen—Cattle-drive on Mr. J. Robinson's Farm, *Nov. 17*, 1065.
- Ballybricken Fair—Assaults on D. Heylin, *Nov. 12*, 556.
- Ballyglass Cattle-drive on 8th inst., *Nov. 17*, 1065.
- Ballyvourney—Case of W. Sheehan, *Nov. 18*, 1226.
- Butler Estate—Disposal of Balischane Farm, *Nov. 20*, 1577.
- Caldbeck Estate—Inspection Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 855.
- Cancer—Death-rate in Ireland, *Nov. 12*, 506.
- Carryduff School, Closing of, *Nov. 20*, 1577.
- Castleconnell—Funeral of Mr. Enright, *Nov. 12*, 549.
- Castletown Bere Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 16*, 885, 886.
- Cavan Evicted Tenants, Land available for, *Nov. 12*, 505, 551.
- Charitable Donations and Bequests—Commissioners and Report, *Nov. 10*, 29–31.
- Charleville Labourers' Cottages Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1227.
- Clare
  - Cattle-drives in October, *Nov. 11*, 295.
  - Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 12*, 557.
  - Moonlighting Outrages in, *Nov. 23*, 1750.
- Clonelly—Land available for Evicted Tenants, *Nov. 19*, 1382.
- Clonguish Band—Disturbance on 12th inst., *Nov. 23*, 1753.
- Clooneen Hartland Farm—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 53.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Colthurst Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 17,* 1066, 1067.
- Condition of Ireland, *Nov. 12,* 553.
  - Outrages not reported, *Nov. 12,* 551.
- Congested Districts Board, Land held by, etc., *Nov. 16,* 848.
- Connaught Winter Assizes, Place of Holding, *Nov. 16,* 888.
- Constabulary
  - Clothing Contracts, Control of, *Nov. 23,* 1762.
  - Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10,* 32; *Nov. 11,* 288, 289, 290; *Nov. 16,* 884, 885.
- Corbehagh—Outrage at House of Cummins, *Nov. 18,* 1225.
- Cork
  - Condition of County, *Nov. 11,* 292.
  - Evicted Tenants—Land available for Reinstatements, *Nov. 10,* 52.
  - Land Purchase Transactions, *Nov. 18,* 1228, 1229.
- Crookenden and Casey Estate—Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 12,* 551; *Nov. 17,* 1067.
- Crown Jewels, Loss of, *Nov. 17,* 1063, 1064.
- Curcreigh—Attack on J. J. McGrath, *Nov. 12,* 554.
- Davoren Estate Sale Proposals, *Nov. 23,* 1752.
- Doolin Disturbance on 18th ult., *Nov. 16,* 886, 887.
- Douglas Estate—Purchase of Grass Lands, *Nov. 10,* 51.
- Drogheda—Cruelty to Cattle, *Nov. 12,* 554.
- Dublin—Founding of State Library, proposed, *Nov. 10,* 33.
- Dursey Island—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 16,* 885.
- Education
  - Intermediate Inspectorate, *Nov. 10,* 56; *Nov. 18,* 1226.
  - Mathematics, Fee for Teaching, *Nov. 23,* 1763.
  - National School Teachers
    - Fees, Payment of, *Nov. 10,* 33.
    - Junior Assistant Mistresses, Grant to, *Nov. 20,* 1578.
- Ely Estate
  - Case of E. McBrien, *Nov. 20,* 1577.
  - Evicted Tenants and Purchase of Land, *Nov. 19,* 1382, 1383.
- Evicted Tenants Act, 1907—Procedure in Dealing with Appeals, *Nov. 11,* 288.
- Evictions
  - Maher, Mrs. M., Case of, *Nov. 19,* 1383.
  - Mulgrew, P., Case of, *Nov. 23,* 1763.
- Firing Outrages—Report by Aggrieved Persons, *Nov. 11,* 291, 292.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Fuge Estate—Sale of Templemary Portion, *Nov. 10,* 53.
- Holycross—Attack on Mr. Clark's House, *Nov. 23,* 1754.
- Infectious Disease, Notification—Medical Views, *Nov. 12,* 507.
- Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23,* 1806-1834, 1838, 1841, 1887, 1889, 1896, 1914.
  - Excluded Tenants, Claims of, *Nov. 11,* 291.
  - Fishery Rights, Inclusion of, proposed, *Nov. 16,* 884.
  - Proposals for Passing into Law this Session, *Nov. 23,* 1914.
  - Provisions of, *Nov. 17,* 1064.
  - Second Reading, Date of, *Nov. 23,* 1915.
- Kenmare Fair Rent Hearings, *Nov. 12,* 557.
- Killea United Irish League Meeting, *Nov. 12,* 550.
- Kilmaleg—Rent of M'Gann's Land, *Nov. 12,* 548.
- Lacken—Outrage at Cushen's House, *Nov. 12,* 550.
- Land (Ireland) Act, 1903
  - Bonus Distributed, *Nov. 10,* 24.
  - Number of Tenants Remaining to be Dealt with, *Nov. 23,* 1748.
- Land Purchase
  - Advances, Information as to, *Nov. 10,* 24, 52.
  - Agreements, Effect of Proposed Legislation on Dealing with, *Nov. 18,* 1208.
  - Present Position—Effect of Projected Legislation, *Nov. 16,* 848.
  - Transactions to Date, *Nov. 11,* 293, 294; *Nov. 16,* 883, 884; *Nov. 18,* 1229, 1230, 1231; *Nov. 23,* 1752.
  - Untenanted Land, Distribution of, *Nov. 10,* 54, 55.
- Leader Estate—Case of Mrs. A. Nagle, *Nov. 12,* 558.
- Limerick Council Borrowing Powers, *Nov. 12,* 558.
- Local Government Board
  - Audit System, *Nov. 17,* 1026, 1027.
  - Auditors, Qualifications of, *Nov. 17,* 1027.
- Longford Labourers' Cottages Loan Application, *Nov. 11,* 287.
- Lunatics—Deportation in Ireland, *Nov. 23,* 1755.
- Macroom Explosions, Inquiry into, *Nov. 12,* 555.
- Magistrates Threatening Letters in Ireland, *Nov. 12,* 552.
- Malone Estate—Cases of Taafe and Ballesty, etc., *Nov. 10,* 34.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Mayo Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 16*, 882, 883.
- Millstreet—Cottage Occupied by D. O'Connor, *Nov. 13*, 726.
- Monydanagha—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 23*, 1753.
- Newspapers—Warning as to Insertion of Certain Notices, *Nov. 11*, 290.
- O'Callaghan—Westropp Estate Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 16*, 888.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Appeals, Method of Dealing with, *Nov. 11*, 287.
  - Infirmary Patients under Treatment, Eligibility of, *Nov. 10*, 56.
  - Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 23*, 1764.
- Poor Law
  - Aged Persons in Receipt of Relief, *Nov. 11*, 286.
  - Commission Report, *Nov. 23*, 1764.
- Reynell Estate—Memorial from Tenants, *Nov. 16*, 847.
- Riverstown Disturbance—Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 10*, 32.
- Rooskey—Magistrates in District, *Nov. 10*, 31.
- Roscrea Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 19*, 1384.
- Sherlock Estate—Inspection of Evicted Tenants' Late Holding, *Nov. 12*, 558.
- Sligo United Irish League Branches, *Nov. 12*, 552.
- Smythe Estate
  - Hopkins, F., Case of, *Nov. 16*, 889.
  - Riggs, Mrs., Case of, *Nov. 17*, 1064.
- Templemore—Bomb Outrage at Mr. O'Mullane's House, *Nov. 11*, 294.
- Thomastown Estate Untenanted Land Acquisition of, *Nov. 17*, 1068.
- Toames, Purchase of, *Nov. 17*, 1028.
- Towerhill Cattle-drive on 7th Instant, *Nov. 18*, 1225.
- Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill
  - Abandonment of, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 33.
  - Provisions of, *Nov. 23*, 1752.
- Wade Estate Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 889.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
- Old-Age Pensions—Proof of Age, *Nov. 10*, 47, 48.

Black Scab
- English and Scottish Areas Affected.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 20*, 1573.
- Irish Outbreak, Measures for Dealing with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 16*, 882.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Stanier, Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 19*, 1412.
- Measures for Preventing Spread of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. L. Hardy; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 510.
  - *Q.* Mr. Stanier; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1794.
  - *Qs.* Mr. R. Harcourt; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1405.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Stanier; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 19*, 1408.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
- Butler Estate — Disposal of Balischane Farm, *Nov. 20*, 1577.
- Education — Discussion of Intermediate Rules, *Nov. 12*, 559.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 59–64, 72.
- Evictions—Case of Bourke, *Nov. 23*, 1795.
- Kenmare Fair Rent Hearings, *Nov. 12*, 556; *Nov. 23*, 1797.
- McGillicuddy Eager Estate—Position of Evicted Tenants, *Nov. 19*, 1419.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 762–764; *Nov. 18*, 1250–1255, 1259, 1275.
- Questions—Procedure in Asking on Friday, *Nov. 13*, 727.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Hunts, Ramsey]
- Canadian Exports in Bond (1903–7), *Nov. 23*, 1748.
- Ramsey — Sanitary Condition, *Nov. 23*, 1757.
- Thames Embankment Motor Traffic, Regulation of, *Nov. 19*, 1372.
- United States Bonded Goods—Provisions in Treaty of Washington, *Nov. 12*, 532.

Bowerman, Mr. C. W. [Deptford]
- Greenock Torpedo Factory—Discharge of Workmen, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
- Motors
  - Metropolitan Speed Restrictions, *Nov. 11*, 280.
  - Speed Limit—Procedure in Dealing with Local Authorities' Applications, *Nov. 11*, 279, 280.
- Navy
  - Dockyards—Selection of Extra Men, *Nov. 10*, 35.
  - Portland Recreation Ground, Labour Employed on, *Nov. 19*, 1389.

[*cont.*

Bowerman, Mr. C. W.—*cont.*
  Navy—*cont.*
    Repairs — Allocation of Contracts, *Nov. 11,* 260.
  Ventnor Post Office — Grievance of Telegraph Clerk, *Nov. 12,* 501.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, N.]
  Capital Expenditure, Amounts issued to meet, *Nov. 23,* 1760.
  Civil Service Examination System, *Nov. 23,* 1791.
  International Naval Conference — Constitution and Terms of Reference, *Nov. 10,* 41.
  Law Courts—Extension Proposals, *Nov. 19,* 1376; *Nov. 23,* 1787, 1788.
  Lights and Lighthouses — Expenditure (1894–5 and 1905–8), *Nov. 23,* 1760.
  Navy
    "Dreadnought" Type — Docks Available on East Coast, *Nov. 11,* 262.
    Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Speed and Cost of, *Nov. 23,* 1767.
  Old-Age Pension Regulations — Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19,* 1559.
  Superannuation Act, Section 7—Financial Limits on Treasury Powers, *Nov. 23,* 1789, 1790.
  "Taunton"—Charge against Crew, *Nov. 11,* 272.
  Unemployment Grant — Amount Unexpended, *Nov. 20,* 1571.

Bradford
  Postmaster-General's Visit, Anticipated Disturbance during.
    Q. Mr. Jowett; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 12,* 515.

Branch, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Enfield]
  Enfield—Sentence Passed on Man for Fowl-Stealing, *Nov. 10,* 21.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10,* 156, 165, 187–189.
  Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 12,* 561, 562; *Nov. 16,* 891; *Nov. 17,* 1071.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley]
  Anthrax—Precautions against Importation, Nov. 11, 250.

Bristol University
  Application for Establishment Presented, *Nov. 17,* 1010, 1017.
  Charter, Proposals as to.
    Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov.* 30, 1574.

British Indians in the Colonies
  Natal
    Armitage Case.
      Q. Mr. Scott; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19,* 1397.
    Education of Indian Children.
      Q. Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 16,* 869.

British South Africa Company
  Government Guarantee of Loan.
    Q. Mr. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 12,* 520.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
  Egypt — Testamentary Dispositions of British Subjects, *Nov 10,* 25.
  Limpsfield School Accommodation, *Nov. 17,* 1025.
  Oxted Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 17,* 1022.

Brooke, Mr. G. S. [Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley]
  Hackney Marshes—Model Yacht Lake Scheme, *Nov. 11,* 278; *Nov. 19,* 1369.
  Poplar Unemployment—Schemes of Work, *Nov. 23,* 1784.
  Workhouse Labour Test, *Nov. 23,* 1786.

Brunner, Rt. Hon. Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
  Tropical Diseases—Action taken on Colonial Governors' Reports, *Nov. 11,* 266.

Bryce, Mr. J. A. [Inverness Burghs]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10,* 81.
  Irish Land Bill, Intro. *Nov. 23,* 1886, 1887, 1890–1893.
  Pension Officer for.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 11,* 253.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Perthshire, E.]
  Administration — Reform Proposals, *Nov. 12,* 526, 527; *Nov. 19,* 1392, 1395.
  Army
    Pension System, *Nov. 16,* 868.
    Poona Officers' Quarters, *Nov. 19,* 1388.
    Promotion of Officers, System of, *Nov. 11,* 258.
  Baroda Education System, *Nov. 11,* 263.
  Bombay Education Standard—Government Resolution, *Nov. 12,* 526.
  Burdwan, Maharajah of—Appreciation of Courage during Attack on Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, *Nov. 12,* 528.
  Chaibasa, Treatment of Geological Students at, *Nov. 19,* 1396.
  India Office, Contracts and Fair Wages Clause, *Nov. 17,* 1032, 1033.

[*cont.*

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*cont.*
  Kanai Lal Dutt, Burial of, after Hanging, *Nov. 16*, 866, 867.
  Liquor Trade—Method of Ascertaining Local Opinion, *Nov. 17*, 1032.
  Midnapur Case, *Nov. 19*, 1393, 1394.
  Nundo Lal Bannerjee, Assassination of, *Nov. 16*, 846.
  Prisoners—Operation of Amnesty, *Nov. 12*, 527, 528.
  Punjab Judgeships, Appointments to, *Nov. 16*, 867, 868.
  Railway Screw Contract, Allocation of, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
  Sedition, Proposals for dealing with, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
  Simla—Boundary of Penrose Estate, *Nov. 23*, 1762.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 348, 433, 649–651, 703.
  War Office—Patent Rights of Mr. J. Bielefeld in Nosebags, *Nov. 16*, 849.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
  Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee, Application from, *Nov. 16*, 875.
  Bastardy Laws—Amendment proposed *Nov. 19*, 1369; *Nov. 23*, 1759, 1784.
  Croydon Distress Committee, Grant for, *Nov. 19*, 1370.
  Emigration—Assisted Passages
    Expenditure on, *Nov. 10*, 43.
    Number in 1907, *Nov. 19*, 1370.
  Finance Act—Section 6, Effect of Refusal to administer, *Nov. 10*, 27.
  Gloucestershire Small Holdings Loan, *Nov. 10*, 43.
  Hackney Marshes Model Yacht Lake Scheme, *Nov. 11*, 279; *Nov. 19*, 1369.
  Hammersmith Poor Law Guardians, Land purchased by, *Nov. 19*, 1385.
  Housing and Town Planning Bill—Legal Attendance on Committee, *Nov. 12*, 541.
  Infant Mortality Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 507.
  Local Authorities' Assets, Basis of estimating in Return, *Nov. 12*, 540, 541.
  Local Government Board Loans, Particulars of, *Nov. 19*, 1370.
  Manchester Women, Unemployment Grant for, *Nov. 19*, 1371.
  Meat, Imported
    American—Tabling of Regulations, *Nov. 16*, 877.
    Foreign Inspection Systems, *Nov. 16*, 876, 877.
  Merthyr Tydvil Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 10*, 44.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Motors
    Metropolitan Speed Restrictions, *Nov. 11*, 280.
    Speed Limit—Local Authorities' Applications, *Nov. 11*, 279, 280; *Nov. 17*, 1018, 1019.
  Old-Age Pensions
    Eligibility, Definition of, *Nov. 23*, 1758.
    Grouping of Small Districts, *Nov. 17*, 1047, 1048.
    Maintenance of Parent, Cost of, *Nov. 23*, 1765.
    Married Couples, Calculation of Means of, *Nov. 16*, 874.
    Poor Relief as a Disqualification, *Nov. 16*, 876; *Nov. 19*, 1386; *Nov. 23*, 1765.
    Sick Pay, Provision as to Income from, *Nov. 23*, 1757.
    Wives of Persons in Receipt of Poor Relief, Eligibility of, *Nov. 12*, 542; *Nov. 17*, 1046, 1047.
  Poor Law
    Aged Persons in Receipt of Relief, *Nov. 11*, 278.
    Deserted Wives with Children—Relief Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1747.
    Unmarried Women with Children—Relief Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1747.
  Poplar Unemployment—Schemes of Work, *Nov. 23*, 1784.
  Ramsey—Sanitary Condition, *Nov. 23*, 1757.
  Roads—Cost of Tar Macadam, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1048.
  Runcorn—Case of Mr. Johnson's Child, *Nov. 12*, 507; *Nov. 19*, 1372.
  Unemployment
    Afforestation Schemes carried out, *Nov. 16*, 875.
    Circular of Local Government Board as to Removal of certain Disqualifications, *Nov. 12*, 539, 540.
    Dillon, Case of, *Nov. 17*, 1023.
    Distress Committees
      Applications refused, *Nov. 18*, 1204.
      Circulation of List, *Nov. 16*, 873.
      Number appointed, *Nov. 16*, 873.
    Grant, Conditions of making Payments from, *Nov. 17*, 1024.
    Grouping of Districts proposed, *Nov. 13*, 713.
    Percentage of Work done, *Nov. 11*, 277.
    Record of Cases, Form of, *Nov. 18*, 1206.
    Register of Applicants, Form of, *Nov. 17*, 1046.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Unemployment—*cont.*
Returns of Proceedings of Distress Committees, *Nov. 16*, 874.
Special Committees set up, *Nov. 19*, 1371.
West Ham Distress Committee, Grant to, *Nov. 12*, 541.
Westminster Improvement Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1785.
Whitechapel Unemployed Men and Workhouse Accommodation, *Nov. 17*, 1024.
Workhouses—Labour Test, *Nov. 23*, 1786.

Business of the House
Course of.
Os. Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. Asquith, Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Rowlands, *Nov. 19*, 1435.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1893–1899.

Butler Estate
Balischane Farm, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 20*, 1577.

Butter
Creamery, Definition of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 11*, 284.
Irish Surprise Competitions, Entries for.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 11*, 285.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Africa, East—Mombassa Mail Service by British India Company, *Nov. 12*, 542,
Ballyshannon Postal Facilities, *Nov. 12*, 503; *Nov. 22*, 1746.
Christmas Work
Applications received, *Nov. 10*, 45.
Men eligible for, *Nov. 19*, 1368;
Pay Rate of, *Nov. 12*, 543.
Telegraph Messengers, Duties of, *Nov. 18*, 1214.
Circulars, Postage on, *Nov. 12*, 518.
City Morning Delivery, Acceleration of, *Nov. 12*, 545.
Derinagree—Case of D. O'Connell, *Nov. 20*, 1573.
Downpatrick Postal Facilities, *Nov. 16*, 891.
Dublin Post Office Civilian Employees, Alleged Displacement of, *Nov. 13*, 726.
Dundee, Post Office, Overtime in, *Nov. 12*, 500.
Eastern Central District
Auxiliary Postmen, *Nov. 16*, 877.
Overtime of Sorters and Letter-carriers, *Nov. 16*, 878.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
Engineers' Branch—Revision of Provincial Office Clerical Force, *Nov. 16*, 850.
Hours of Duty in certain Provincial Offices, *Nov. 11*, 249; *Nov. 12*, 546.
Leave of Absence, Decision as to, *Nov. 17*, 1018.
Longford, Telephone Extension to, *Nov. 23*, 1801.
Mail Service with France—Time occupied, *Nov. 12*, 544, 545.
Morocco—Facilities for Cash-on-delivery System, *Nov. 18*, 1215.
Newspapers—Despatch to North America *Nov. 23*, 1787.
Parcel Post Baskets for Irish Service, *Nov. 11*, 251; *Nov. 12*, 502.
Penny Postage with United States, Returns as to, *Nov. 19*, 1368.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 693.
Postmen
Adult night Messengers, Eligibility of, *Nov. 18*, 1215.
Auxiliary Rural-pay in Ireland, *Nov. 16*, 841.
Pay on Transfer, *Nov. 12*, 501.
Riverstown Postmaster, Allegations against, *Nov. 18*, 1232; *Nov. 23*, 1802.
Ross Postal Facilities, *Nov. 11*, 249.
Split Duties, Effect of Abolition of, *Nov. 12*, 543.
Stores Contracts, Allocation of, *Nov. 23*, 1756.
Telephone Service
Employees, Qualifications of, *Nov. 19*, 1364.
National Telephone Company
Employees, Position of, *Nov. 12*, 546.
Materials used in laying New Lines, *Nov. 12*, 546.
Towels of Clerks, Payment for Washing of, *Nov. 16*, 850.
Travelling Allowance of Officials, *Nov. 20*, 1574.
Twickenham, Cost of Living in, *Nov. 11*, 248.
Ventnor Post Office—Grievance of Telegraph Clerk, *Nov. 12*, 502.

Byles, Mr. W. P. (Salford, N.)
Copyright International Conference—Amendments proposed to British Law, *Nov. 16*, 872.
Natal Native Affairs—Provisions of Bill, *Nov. 12*, 530.
Naval Expenditure—International Reduction proposed, *Nov. 16*, 861, 862.
Warlike Expenditure—Comparison with certain Nations, *Nov. 19*, 1430.
Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment of Mrs. and Miss Pankhurst, *Nov. 17*, 1041.

Caldbeck Estate
Inspection Proposals.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 854.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin, University]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 745–748.

Camperdown, Earl of
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 469.
Local Authorities [Admission of the Press] Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 17*, 1011, 1012, 1014.

Canada
[*See also Names of States.*]
British Trade Correspondents, Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. Barrie, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 11*, 276.
Deported Persons, Information as to.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 10*, 25.
Esquimault, Defence of.
Qs. Earl Winterton, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 16*, 856.
Exports in Bond (1903–7).
Q. Mr. Boulton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 23*, 1748.

Cancer
Death Rate in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Birrell; *Nov. 12*, 505.

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Nurses' Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 9.

Cape Colony
Stamp and Licences Act, Provisions of.
Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 12*, 517.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
Admiralty Contracts—Purchase of British Articles, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
Bastardy Law, Amendment of, *Nov. 23*. 1783.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 95–99, 127.
Estate Duty Office—Promotion and Pay of Clerical Staff, *Nov. 17*, 1053, 1054.
Licensing Statistics (1900-8), *Nov. 12*, 535.
Old-Age Pensions—Cost of Maintenance of Parent, *Nov. 23*, 1765.
Orange River Colony Civil Service—British-born Persons reduced in *Status*, *Nov. 16*, 868, 869.
Superannuation — Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 23*, 1802.
Transvaal Civil Service
British-born Persons reduced in *Status*, *Nov. 16*, 868, 869.
Command Paper 4353, *Nov. 23*, 1771. 1772.

Carnadoe Creamery
Drainage Disposal.
Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 16*, 853.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 406; *Nov. 12*, 693, 694.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*
Pennsylvania, Outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease in, *Nov. 19*, 1361.

Carryduff
School, Cause for Closing.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 20*, 1577.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1118; *Nov. 19*, 1483–1490, 1516–1519.

Castleconnell
Funeral of Mr. Enright.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. Lundon, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 12*, 548.

Castletown Bere
Labourers' Cottages Scheme.
Qs. Mr. Gilhooly; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 885.

Cathcart
School Site, Area and Cost of.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 16*, 851; *Nov. 23*, 1756.

Cattle
Canadian—Committee inquiring into subject.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 10*, 42.

Cavan
Evicted Tenants, Land available for.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 504, 551.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 781, 788; *Nov. 17*, 1073–1080, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1118, 1135; *Nov. 19*, 1469–1472, 1476, 1479, 1480, 1481.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 362–364, 445–448.

Cawdor, Earl
Defence of the Empire, *Nov. 23*, 1738.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales No. 2) Bill
Amendments, Proposals as to *Nov. 17*, 1071.

[*cont.*

Cecil, Lord R.—*cont.*
- Education (No. 2) Bill—*cont.*
  - Settlement, Government Proposals for Effecting, *Nov. 19*, 1435.
- Housing and Town Planning Bill—Legal Attendance on Committee, *Nov. 12*, 541 ; *Nov. 17*, 1072.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 795.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Delay, Proposals for Obviating, *Nov. 17*, 1059.
  - Instructions—Date of Issue, *Nov. 17*, 1057 ; *Nov. 19*, 1379.
  - Regulations, Annulment of certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1555-1559.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 408-410, 412, 434 ; *Nov. 12*, 696, 699.
- Rhodesia—Trial by Jury, Amendment of Law, *Nov. 19*, 1399.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 776.

Census of Production Act
- Rules Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3 ; *Nov. 16* 809, 839 ; *Nov. 19*, 1353, 1362.

Ceylon
- Colombo
  - Government Workshops and Private Work.
    - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
  - Graving Dock
    - Ship Repairs by the Government.
      - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 10*, 37.
    - Workshops, Contract for.
      - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
  - Wesley College Estimates.
    - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
- Public Works System.
  - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 10*, 37.
- South Indian Labour Agency, Subsidy to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1033.

Chairman and Deputy Chairman—Rulings
- Licensing Bill—Amendment Out of Order, *Nov. 19*, 1504.
- Port of London Bill
  - Amendment Out of Order, *Nov. 11*, 404.
  - Criticisms on, Action of other Committees wasnot in Order, *Nov. 11*, 363, 364 ; *Nov. 12*, 568.
  - Discussion of whole Subject on Amendments, *Nov. 11*, 361.
  - Irrelevant Matter, *Nov. 11*, 337, 347, 348 ; *Nov. 12*, 608, 617, 619, 629, 651.

Chairman and Deputy Chairman—Rulings—*cont.*
- Port of London Bill—*cont.*
  - Motion to Report Progress, *Nov. 11*, 432.
  - New Clauses, Moving of, *Nov. 12*, 701.
  - Trinity House Duties, Amendment as to was not Out of Order, *Nov. 11*, 436, 439, 442.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—*Rt. Hon Viscount Fowler*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.*

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 794.

Charleville
- Labourers' Cottages, Applications.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov 18*, 1226.

Cherry, Right Hon. R.R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
- Cattle-driving
  - Procedure in Dealing with Arrested Persons, *Nov. 11*, 285, 286.
  - Treatment of certain Prisoners, *Nov. 19*, 1426.
- Civil Service Estimates—Subhead A., Vote 32, Class 2, Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1020, 1062.
- Colthurst Estate—Case of J. Creedon, *Nov. 19*, 1423.
- Connaught Winter Assizes, Place of Holding, *Nov. 16*, 888.
- Cork Land Purchase Prices, etc., *Nov. 23*, 1798.
- Education
  - Inspectors, Appointment of, *Nov. 23*, 1799.
  - Intermediate—Grants and Examination Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
  - Marlborough Street Training College—Residential Quarters, *Nov. 19*, 1421.
- Ennis Quarter Sessions—Case of Mr. Hogan, *Nov. 19*, 1421, 1422.
- Enniscorthy Vaccination Defaulters, *Nov. 19*, 1427.
- Evictions
  - Bourke, J. J., Case of, *Nov. 23*, 1796.
  - Procedure in Effecting Reinstatements, *Nov. 19*, 1414.
- Fermanagh—Management of Vaughan's Charity School, *Nov. 23*, 1759.
- Firearm Traffic—Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1422.
- Fitzpatrick Estate—Case of Mr. J. McSweeney, *Nov. 19*, 1429.
- Fort Fergus—Cattle-drive on 13th inst., *Nov. 19*, 1420, 1421.

[*cont.*

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*cont.*
- Galway
  - Constabulary—Extra Force, *Nov. 19*, 1364, 1425, 1426.
  - Land Purchase Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1800.
- Irish Land Bill, *Intro.*, *Nov. 23*, 1873, 1878.
- Irish Universities Bill, Date of Issuing Charters, *Nov. 19*, 1419.
- Kenmare Land Commission Decisions, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
- Liscannor Harbour, Condition of, *Nov. 19*, 1413.
- McGillicuddy Eager Estate—Position of Evicted Tenants, *Nov. 19*, 1419.
- Newspapers—Warning as to Publication of Certain Resolutions, *Nov. 19*, 1420.
- O'Leary Estate—Cases of B. Mayneham, P. Cotter and J. J. Riordan, *Nov. 19*, 1423.
- Old-Age Pensions—Facilities for Ascertaining Age, *Nov. 19*, 1428.
- Phibbs Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 19*, 1418, 1419.
- Railways—Irish Commission Sittings, *Nov. 19*, 1425.
- Riverstown
  - Boycotting in District, *Nov. 18*, 1224.
  - Condition of District, *Nov. 19*, 1413, 1414.
  - Disturbance on 29th ult., *Nov. 19*, 1416–1418, 1424; *Nov. 23*, 1796.
- Style Park—Case of Mr. J. Coleman, *Nov 19*, 1420.
- Tullaroan—Disturbance on 10th inst., *Nov. 19*, 1428.
- Wallis Estate—Case of T. J. O'Keeffe, *Nov. 19*, 1424.

Chief Secretary for Ireland—*Rt. Hon A. Birrell.*

Children Bill
- *l. Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 458.

China
- Fa-ku-men Railway, Withdrawal of Japanese Protest against.
  - *Q.* Earl of Ronaldshay; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 41.

Christchurch
- Sewerage Scheme
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 849.

Church of England
- Stipendiary Curates
  - Assistant—Position in Convocation.
    - *Q.* Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 892.
  - Tenure of Office.
    - *Q.* Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 23*, 1803.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Dundee]
- Canada
  - British Trade Correspondents, Appointment of, *Nov. 11*, 277.
  - Cattle—Committee Inquiring into Subject, *Nov. 10*, 42.
  - Deported Persons, Information as to, *Nov. 10*, 25.
  - Exports in Bond (1903–7), *Nov. 23*, 1750.
- Copyright—International Conference
  - Amendments proposed to British Law, *Nov. 11*, 276; *Nov. 16*, 872, 873; *Nov. 23*, 1782.
  - British Delegates, *Nov. 12*, 518.
  - Report, Date of Presenting, *Nov. 16*, 852.
  - Translation of Alterations proposed by, *Nov. 11*, 276.
- Cotton Trade—Sliding Scale for Wages, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 536.
- France—Import Duty on Limes and Lemons, *Nov. 17*, 1043.
- Gun Trade—Proof-Marking of Imports, *Nov. 12*, 537.
- Iron and Steel
  - Import and Export Statistics (1907), *Nov. 11*, 272.
  - Royalty in United Kingdom and Certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 17*, 1046.
- Investments Abroad—Estimate (1900–7), *Nov. 12*, 538.
- Lights and Lighthouses — Expenditure (1894–5 and 1905–8), *Nov. 23*, 1760.
- Merchant Shipping Act, 1906—Application to Foreign Vessels, *Nov. 12*, 536.
- Nottingham — Delay in Railway Delivery North of York, *Nov. 13*, 725.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 328, 352, 355, 357, 361, 362, 370, 394–397, 402, 407, 409, 416, 418, 425, 430, 432, 434, 435, 438, 443, 449, 453; *Nov. 12*, 619–626, 657, 659, 664, 667, 668, 670, 673, 677, 679, 681, 682, 684, 687, 689, 690, 691, 692, 694, 695, 696, 697, 701, 702, 703, 705, 707, 708, 710, 712.
- Port of London Shipping Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 503.
- Railways
  - Combines
    - Effect on Position of Small Shareholder, *Nov. 17*, 1044.
    - Powers of Board of Trade, *Nov. 11*, 275.
  - Underground Electric Companies—Proposals for Conciliation Boards, *Nov. 12*, 538, 539.
- Railway and Canal Commission — Working Agreements, Applications for Sanction to, *Nov. 17*, 1045.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*cont.*

Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy, Construction of, *Nov. 17*, 1068.

Trade Records—Report, Translation of German Customs Union Rules, *Nov. 16*, 841.

United States *Bulletin*—Articles on Wages and Food, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

Wages Census, Progress made with, *Nov. 13*, 725.

"Zeeland," s.s.—Crew engaged at Antwerp, *Nov. 10*, 22.

Civil Contingencies Fund

Accounts — Return Ordered, *Nov. 18*, 1199; Presented, *Nov. 19*, 1362.

Civil Service

Assistant Clerks, Memorial from.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 25.

Boy Clerks, Proposals as to.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 16*, 852.

Examinations, System of Holding.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1791.

Second Division Clerks promoted in 1908.
Qs. Mr. Nield; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1789.

Superannuation, *see that Title.*

Civil Service Estimates

Subhead A., Vote 32, Class 2, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 17*, 1020, 1062.

Civil Service Supply Association

Management of.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 11*, 253.

Clare

Cattle-Drives in October.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 295.

Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 557.

Moonlighting Outrages in.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1750.

Clifford of Chudleigh, Lord

Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 474, 495.

Clive, Captain P. A. [Hereford, Ross]

Orange River Colony Loan, Guarantee of, *Nov. 17*, 1036.

Ordnance Survey Maps—Placing Copies in County Towns proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1052.

Parkhurst Barracks, Baths in, *Nov. 18*, 1212.

Clive, Captain P.A.—*cont.*

Parkhurst Prison, Baths provided, *Nov. 18*, 1213.

Radnorshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 17*, 1051.

Rosyth Works—Loan, Issue of, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1071.

Small Holdings, Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1052.

Clonelly

Land available for Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 19*, 1382.

Clonguish

Band—Disturbance on 12th inst.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1753.

Clooneen Hartland Farm

Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 52.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorks., W.R., Skipton]

Elementary Education (England and Wales, No. 2) Bill—Proposals as to, *Nov. 12*, 561.

Licensing Bill—Clubs, Government Amendments, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1070.

Clynes, Mr. J. R. [Manchester, N.E.]

Afforestation Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *Nov. 10*, 56.

Hammersmith Poor Law Guardians, Land purchased by, *Nov. 19*, 1385.

Manchester Women, Unemployment Grant for, *Nov. 19*, 1371.

Poor Law
  Deserted Wives with Children—Relief Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1747.
  Unmarried Women with Children—Relief Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1747.

Unemployment—Special Committees set up, *Nov. 19*, 1371.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill

c. Report from Standing Committee C, *Nov. 18*, 1232.

Date of Taking.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 23*, 1803.

Coastguard

Changes, Procedure in effecting.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1025.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]

Army Officers—Examination of Candidates for Commissions, *Nov. 10*, 36.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 88–90, 109, 151–156, 177, 181, 210,

Coleridge, Lord
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 490.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Agricultural Education in Elementary Schools Bill, Facilities for, *Nov. 12*, 560.
Education Inspectors' Reports, Discontinuance of, *Nov. 13*, 714; *Nov. 17*, 1049.
Emigration
  Assisted Passages in 1907, *Nov. 19*, 1370.
  Information Office, Grant to, *Nov. 19*, 1399.
Gun Trade—Proof-Marking of Imports, *Nov. 12*, 536, 537.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 946–948; *Nov. 20*, 1616.
Shropshire Small Holdings Scheme, *Nov. 19*, 1409.
Small Holding Co-operative Societies, *Nov. 19*, 1409, 1410.
Small Holdings Act, 1892, Amendment Bill, Facilities for, *Nov. 12*, 560, 561.

Collins, Mr. S. [Lambeth, Kennington]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 766–768.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Bristol University Charter, *Nov. 20*, 1574.
Education Board—Women Inspectors Employed, *Nov. 11*, 249.
Hop Industry
  Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 28.
  Production Statistics, *Nov. 11*, 254.
  National Telephone Company Employees, Position of, *Nov. 12*, 546.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 387.
Regent's Park Lake, Cleansing of, *Nov. 12*, 520.
University College Grants—Report of Committee, *Nov. 19*, 1385.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
Under-Secretary—Colonel Seely.

Colonial Securities
Facilities for Small Investors.
  Qs. Mr. Beck; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 48.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For Particular Colonies, etc., see their Names.*]
Annual Reports Presented, *Nov. 12*, 457; *Nov. 13*, 713; *Nov. 16*, 809, 838; *Nov. 18*, 1186, 1198.
Crown Colonies with Government Workshops Undertaking Private Business.
  Qs. Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. Rees; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1034.

Colonies and Protectorates—*cont.*
Import Duties—Returns, etc., Presented, *Nov. 10*, 2.
Naval Visits, Appreciation of.
  Q. Sir J. Randles; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19*, 1396.

Colthurst Estate
Case of J. Creedon.
  Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1423.
Sale Proposals.
  Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1065.

Companies Consolidation Bill
c. 1R.* *Nov. 17*, 1073.
  Report from Joint Committee, *Nov. 12*, 457, 563.

Congested Districts Board
Land Held by, etc.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 847.

Congo Free State
Belgian Annexation
  Date of Presenting Despatch.
    Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 19*, 1400.
  Present Position.
    Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 39.
British Consular Reports.
  Q. Earl of Ronaldshay; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 38.
Correspondence Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1678, 1744.
Forced Labour—Belgian Attitude.
  Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 40.
Mission Sites, Guarantees as to.
  Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 40.

Connaught
Winter Assizes, Place of Holding.
  Qs. Mr. Gwynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 16*, 888.

Consols
Facilities for Small Investors.
  Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1570.
Foreign Investors in.
  Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1060.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also Names of Places.*]
Clothing Contracts, Control of,
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1762.

Constabulary, Royal Irish—*cont.*

Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 32.
Qs. Mr. Barrie, Mr. Mooney, Mr. W. O'Brien, Captain Craig, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 288.
Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 884.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 890.

Pay, Pensions, etc., Provision for.
Resolution (Mr. Cherry), *Nov. 17*, 1184; Reported, *Nov. 19*, 1554.

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill

c. 1R.* *Nov. 19*, 1554.

Cooper, Mr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]

Copyright—International Conference
British Delegates, *Nov, 12*, 518.
Translation of Alterations proposed by, *Nov. 11*, 276.

London—Ambulances at Police Stations (1891–1907), *Nov. 12*, 518.

Prisoners, Books and Writing Materials permitted to, *Nov. 17*, 1042.

Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *Nov. 17*, 1040, 1041.
Pankhurst, Mrs. and Miss, Case of, *Nov. 17*, 1041.

Copyright

International Conference
British Delegates.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 518.
Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 16*, 852.
Suggestion for Restriction.
Q. Sir P. Magnus; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 11*, 275.
Qs. Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 16*, 872.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 23*, 1782.
Translation of Alterations proposed by.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 11*, 276.

Corbehagh

Outrage at House of Cummins.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Cork

Condition of County.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 292.

Cork—*cont.*

Evicted Tenants—Land Available for Reinstatements.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 52.

Land Purchase Transactions.
Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1227.
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. W. O'Brien, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. O'Shee; *As.* Mr. Cherry, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 23*, 1798.

Cornwall, Duchy of

Lord Warden—Right Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 682, 692.

Cory, Sir C. J. [Cornwall, St. Ives]

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 657.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]

India
Administration—Reform Proposals, *Nov. 12*, 526, 527; *Nov. 19*, 1392.
Midnapur Case, *Nov. 19*, 1394.
Prisoners—Operation of Amnesty, *Nov. 12*, 527.

Cotton Trade

Sliding Scale for Wages, proposed.
Q. Mr. Haworth; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 535.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]

Army—Special Reserve Officers, Employment of, *Nov. 23*, 1755.

Bastardy Law, Amendment of, *Nov. 23*, 1758.

Foot and Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Nov. 23*, 1755.

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1280–1282; *Nov. 19*, 1523–1526.

Liquor Traffic—Obligations of Innkeeper, *Nov. 19*, 1431.

Post Office Clerks, Payment for Washing of Towels, *Nov. 16*, 850.

Rifle Clubs, Supply of Ammunition to, *Nov. 18*, 1211.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]

Burdwan, Maharajah of—Appreciation of Courage during Attack on Lieut.-Governor of Bengal, *Nov. 12*, 528.

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 782.

Old-Age Pension Regulations, Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1563.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
  Army
    Curragh Camp, Condition of Beresford Barracks, *Nov. 16*, 865.
    Soldiers, Consumptive—Government Proposals as to, *Nov. 11*, 297.
  Athenry Eviction on 2nd inst. *Nov. 12*, 555.
  Autumn Session, Duration of, *Nov. 16*, 891.
  Ballinameen, Cattle Drive on Mr. J. Robinson's Farm, *Nov. 17*, 1065.
  Ballybricken Fair, Assaults on D. Heylin, *Nov. 12*, 555, 556.
  Ballyglass, Cattle Drive on 8th inst., *Nov. 17*, 1064.
  Carryduff School, Closing of, *Nov. 20*, 1577.
  Castleconnell, Funeral of Mr. Enright, *Nov. 12*, 548, 549.
  Clare, Cattle Drives in October, *Nov. 11*, 295.
  Constabulary—Legislative Proposals, *Nov 11*, 289; *Nov. 16*, 890.
  Curcreigh—Attack on J. J. McGrath, *Nov. 12*, 554.
  Downpatrick Postal Facilities, *Nov. 16*, 890, 891.
  Drogheda—Cruelty to Cattle, *Nov. 12*, 553.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 125, 155, 179, 205.
  Ennis Quarter Sessions—Case of Mr. Hogan, *Nov. 19*, 1422.
  Evictions—Procedure in Effecting Reinstatements, *Nov. 19*, 1414.
  Firing Outrages—Report by Aggrieved Persons, *Nov. 11*, 292.
  Home Rule—Identity of Irish American Visitors, *Nov. 16*, 871, 872.
  Income Tax—Clergy Liability, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
  Killea—United Irish League Meeting, *Nov. 12*, 550.
  Lacken—Outrage at Cushen's House, *Nov. 12*, 550.
  Macroom Explosions, Inquiry into, *Nov. 12*, 554, 555.
  National School Junior Assistant Mistresses, Grant to, *Nov. 20*, 1578.
  Orange River Colony Loan, Guarantee of, *Nov. 17*, 1036.
  Phibbs Estate—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 19*, 1418.
  Riverstown District, Condition of, *Nov. 19*, 1413, 1414.
  Russia—Luxenburg Case, *Nov. 19*, 1400.
  Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy, Construction of, *Nov. 17*, 1068.

Craig, Captain J.—*cont.*
  Templemore—Bomb Outrage at Mr. O'Mullane's House, *Nov. 11*, 294.
  Tuberculosis—Milch Cows and Tuberculin Test, *Nov. 17*, 1050.
  Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill, Scope of, *Nov. 17*, 1069.
  Tullaroan Disturbance on 10th inst., *Nov. 19*, 1428.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
  Castleconnell, Funeral of Mr. Enright, *Nov. 12*, 549.
  Condition of Ireland, *Nov. 12*, 553.
    Outrages not Reported, *Nov. 12*, 551.
  Constabulary—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 32.
  Drogheda—Cruelty to Cattle, *Nov. 12*, 553.
  Magistrates—Threatening Letters in Ireland, *Nov. 12*, 552.
  Murdered—Use of Expression by Member, *Nov. 23*, 1796, 1797.
  Riverstown—Attack on Police on 29th ult., *Nov. 23*, 1796, 1797.
  Ross Postal Facilities, *Nov. 11*, 249.
  Sligo United Irish League Branches, *Nov 12*, 552.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 66–71, 95, 110, 113, 127, 128, 131–138, 154, 166, 191, 197–199, 207, 208.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord Privy Seal and Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
  Army—Organisation of as a means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1719, 1736, 1737.
  Bills, Precedence for—Suspension of Standing Order No. XXI., *Nov. 18*, 1189.
  Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 463, 464, 469, 482, 489, 494, 497.
  Defence of the Empire
    Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23*, 1714–1725.
    Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1715, 1720–1724.
    Navy as First Line of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1718, 1721, 1722, 1938.
  Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1195; *Nov. 19*, 1356, 1359.
  Nurses Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 16–18.

Crockham Hill Farm
  Price of.
    Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 512.

Cromarty

Fishermen, Procedure in prosecuting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Nov. 18,* 1199.

Cromer, Earl of

Army—Organisation of as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23,* 1706.

Children Bill, *Rep., Nov. 12,* 465.

Defence of the Empire

Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23,* 1704–1706.

Invasion—Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23,* 1706, 1707.

Crookenden and Casey Estate

Purchase Proposals.
Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12,* 551; *Nov. 17,* 1067.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]

Edinburgh Coopers, Charge against, *Nov. 12,* 512.

Forest Gate—Station Road, Tradesmen's Stalls, *Nov. 16,* 869.

Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11,* 415, 428; *Nov. 12,* 693.

Small Holdings

Demand for, Method of ascertaining, *Nov. 18,* 1220.

Rejection, Procedure in Appealing against, *Nov. 18,* 1220.

Unemployment—Local Government Board Circular, *Nov. 12,* 540.

Woolwich Tramway Improvement Scheme, *Nov. 16,* 848.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10,* 91, 92, 94, 115.

Report and Third Reading Stages, Allocation of Time for, *Nov. 10,* 58.

Crown Colonies

See under Colonies.

Crown Lands

Work for Unemployed on.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17,* 1052.

Croydon

Distress Committee, Grant for.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19,* 1369.

Cuba

Budget (1908–9) Presented, *Nov. 17,* 1009.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]

Old-Age Pensions

Appeals, Method of dealing with, *Nov. 11,* 287.

Claims, Time taken in Investigation, *Nov. 10,* 50.

Infirmary Patients under Treatment, Eligibility of, *Nov. 10,* 56.

Cumberland

Surrendered Licences, Payment to County Council for.
Q. Mr. Howard; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Nov. 11,* 270.

Curcreigh

Attack on J. J. McGrath.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12,* 554.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]

National Telephone Company—Material used in laying New Lines, *Nov. 12,* 546.

Old-Age Pensions—Grouping of Small Districts, *Nov. 17,* 1047, 1048.

Peterhead Harbour Works—Discharge of Workmen, *Nov. 19,* 1391, 1392.

Postmen — Eligibility of Adult Night Messengers, *Nov. 18,* 1215.

Unemployment—Grouping of Districts, proposed, *Nov. 13,* 713.

Customs and Excise

Abstractor Clerks, Pensions of.
Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17,* 1054; *Nov. 23,* 1792.

Overtime in Statistical Department.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse. *Nov. 17,* 1054.

Superintendents

Classification of.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17,* 1059.

Promotion of.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23,* 1749.

Dartmouth, Earl of

Territorial Force Permanent Staff

Reduction in Number of, *Nov. 16,* 810.

Reposting to Regiments—Powers of Commanding Officers, *Nov. 16,* 811–813, 816, 817.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

"Agnes Donohœ"—Compensation Claim, *Nov. 19,* 1400.

Agriculture Department—Assistance to Cattle and Horse-breeding Schemes in Ireland, *Nov. 17,* 1062.

Death Duties—Separate Returns for Wales, proposed, *Nov. 19,* 1380.

Income-Tax—Separate Returns for Wales Proposed, *Nov. 19,* 1380.

Milch Cows and Tuberculin Test, *Nov. 17,* 1050.

Milk Analysis by London County Council, *Nov. 19* 1408.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1280.
  Poor Law
    Aged Persons in Receipt of Relief, *Nov. 11*, 278, 283, 286.
    Scottish Relief Statistics, *Nov. 16*, 881.

Davoren Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1752.

Death Duties
  Estate Duty
    Office Staff, Grievances of.
      Qs. Mr. Thornton, Earl of Ronaldshay; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 45.
      Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1053, 1054.
      Qs. Mr. Nield; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1788.
    Scottish Payments—Effect of Gunning Case.
      Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 47.
  Separate Returns for Wales, proposed.
    Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1380.

Deaths
  Infant Mortality Statistics.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12*, 507

Defence of the Empire
  Adequacy of Present System.
    Os. Earl Roberts, *Nov. 23*, 1679–1696; Lord Lovat, 1696–1704; Earl of Cromer, 1704–1706; Viscount Midleton, 1710, 1714; Earl of Crewe, 1714–1725; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1730; Viscount Milner, 1738–1741; Earl of Wemyss, 1741, 1742; Lord Loreburn, 1742.
  Compulsory Military Training, proposed.
    Os. Viscount Midleton, *Nov. 23*, 1710, 1711; Lord Grenfell, 1729, 1730.
  Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against.
    Os. Earl Roberts, *Nov. 23*, 1679, 1683–1691, 1696, 1741; Lord Lovat, 1697–1704; Earl of Cromer, 1706, 1707; Viscount Midleton, 1708–1710; Earl of Crewe, 1715, 1720–1724; Lord Grenfell, 1725; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1731–1736; Marquess of Salisbury, 1741.
  Navy as First Line of Defence.
    Os. Lord Lovat, *Nov. 23*, 1702, 1703; Earl of Crewe, 1708, 1721, 1722, 1738; Earl Cawdor, 1738.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
  Caldbeck Estate, Inspection Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 854.

Denman, Lord
  Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1192–1195; *Nov. 19*, 1353–1355, 1357, 1358.

Derbyshire
  Small Holdings Applications.
    Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1384.

Derinagree
  Case of D. O'Connell.
    Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 20*, 1572.

Dewar, Sir J. A. [Inverness]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 122.

Dickinson, Mr. W. H. [St. Pancras, N.]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 988–993.
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 427; *Nov. 12*, 659–663, 669, 708, 709.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
  Congo Free State—Belgian Annexation, Date of Presenting Despatch, *Nov. 19*, 1400.
  Old-Age Pension Regulations, Amendment of Article 25, *Nov. 18*, 1205.
  South African War, History of—Pay of Officers Employed, *Nov. 23*, 1759.
  Transvaal Natives—Eviction under a Law of 1895, *Nov. 17*, 1033.
  Truck Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Nov. 18*, 1202.
  Wages Census, Progress made with, *Nov. 13*, 725.
  War Office
    Headquarters Staff—Revision proposed, *Nov. 23*, 1769.
    Historical or Literary Department, *Nov. 23*, 1769.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
  Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1899–1908.

Diseases of Animals Acts
  "Minnesota," s.s.—Order Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.
  Order No. 7599 Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1679, 1645.

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. D. [Middlesex, Uxbridge]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 593–596.

Dockyards, Naval
  See under Navy.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Irish Afforestation Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 284.
Lunatic Pensioners, Position of, *Nov. 23*, 1800.
Old-Age Pension for Wife of Man receiving Poor Relief, *Nov. 17*, 1047.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 480, 483, 493.
Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1195; *Nov. 19*, 1357.
Local Authorities [Admission of the Press] Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 17*, 1011–1015.

Doolin
Disturbance on 18th ult.
Qs. Mr. Halpin, Mr. Belloc, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 886.

Dormer, Baron
Bankruptcy Certificate Presented, *Nov. 10*, 1.

Dorsetshire
Small Holdings Applications.
Qs. Mr. Wills, Mr. Morrell, Mr. Ward, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Rowlands; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 19*, 1403, 1404.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
"Taurus," Steam Trawler, Arrest by German Gun-boat, *Nov. 12*, 532.
Telephone Coast Communication, Value of, *Nov. 11*, 259.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 19*, 1435.
Education, Government Proposals for Effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1432, 1433.

Douglas Estate
Purchase of Grass Lands.
Q. Mr. J. Phillips; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 51.

Downpatrick
Postal Facilities.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16*, 890.

Drogheda
Cruelty to Cattle.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 553.

Du Cros, Mr. A. [Hastings.]
Admiralty—Pay of First Sea Lord, *Nov. 16*, 853.
Postmen—Pay on Transfer, *Nov. 12*, 500.

Dublin
Crown Jewels, Loss of, *see under* Ireland.
Library, State—Founding of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 32.
Post Office Civilian Employees, Allegation as to proposed displacement of.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 13*, 725.

Duncan, Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
Barrow-in-Furness Distress Committee, Application from, *Nov. 16*, 875.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 931.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanarkshire, Govan]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 121, 147, 148, 202–204.

Dundee
Naval Base, Suitability for.
Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1390.
Post Office, Overtime in.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 500.

Durham
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17*, 1051.

Dursey Island
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 885.

Edenbridge
Case of D. Nicholls.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 508.

Edinburgh
Coopers, Charge against.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A* Mr. T. Shaw, *Nov. 12*, 512.
Dispute between Town Council and Distress Committee.
Qs. Sir G. McCrae, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 11*, 282.

Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners
Old-Age Pensions Paid by.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1061.

Education Board
President—Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. Trevelyan.
Women Inspectors Employed.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 11*, 249.

Education, England and Wales
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
- Grants
  - Conditions of Giving.
    Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 18*, 1216.
  - Statutory System of Distribution.
    Qs. Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 18*, 1215.
- Inspectors' Reports, Discontinuance of.
  Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 13*, 714.
  Qs. Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 17*, 1049.
- Number of Scholars on Registers.
  Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 11*, 281.
- Registration Council Scheme—Correspondence Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1678, 1745.
- School Building Grant—Amount Allotted.
  Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 10*, 45.
- Secondary Schools—Return as to Pupils and Pupil-teachers Ordered, *Nov. 18*, 1198.
- Special Grants—Regulations Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1198; *Nov. 19*, 1353.
- Welsh School and Attendance Statistics.
  Qs. Mr. W. Roch; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 19*, 1374; *Nov. 23*, 1787.

Education, Ireland
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
- Inspectors, Appointment of.
  Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. J. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1799.
- Intermedate
  - Girls presenting themselves for Examination.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
  - Grants.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
  - Inspectorate.
    Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 55; *Nov. 18*, 1226.
  - Rule 14—Rule in Substitution Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.
  - Rules, Discussion of.
    Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 12*, 559.
- Marlborough Street Training College—Grant for Residential Quarters.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1421.
- Mathematics, Fees for Teaching.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1763.
- National School Teachers
  - Fees, Payment of.
    Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 33.
  - Junior Assistant Mistresses, Grant to.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 20*, 1578.

Education, Scotland
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
- Fund, Distribution of.
  Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 19*, 1375.
- School Attendance Grant.
  Qs. Mr. Pirie; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 16*, 850.
  Qs. Mr. Menzies; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 880.
- Travelling Expenses of Departmental Officials.
  Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 20*, 1574.

Education (Provision of Meals) Act
- Adoption by Local Authorities.
  Q. Mr. Henry; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 17*, 1048.
- Levy of Rate—Cases sanctioned.
  Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 20*, 1575.
- Section 3, Applications under.
  Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 19*, 1373.

Education (Scotland) Bill
- *c. Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 59.
- Date of taking.
  Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 892.
- Debate on Consideration (Commons), *Nov. 10*, 59.
  - Clause 15, Recommittal in respect of, proposed, 59, 66.
  - Continuation Schools, Provisions as to Attendance at, 179–186, 207–211.
  - Defective Children—Parents to provide for Education up to Age of Sixteen, 126–129.
  - Domestic Arts, Instruction in, 194.
  - Elementary Education up to Age of Fourteen, Duty of Parent to provide, 158–164.
  - Feeding of School Children, Provision for, 152–158.
  - Hostels, Establishment of, proposed, 107–122, 125.
  - Military Drill and Training, Provision of, 194–204.
  - Non-attendance, Procedure in Cases of, 165–174, 177–179.
  - Penalties imposed on Persons employing Children of School Age, 190–193, 211.
  - Roman Catholic Schools, Position of as to Grants, etc., 61–100.
  - School Board Districts, Constitution of, 129–150.
  - Teaching of National Anthem and Emblematic Meaning of National Flag, proposed, 205-207.

[*cont.*

Education (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
Electors Enfranchised under.
Qs. Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 16*, 845.
Eleven o'Clock—Motion for Suspension (Mr. Asquith), *Nov. 10*, 58.
Report and Third Reading Stages, Allocation of Time for.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, *Nov. 10*, 57; Mr. Asquith, Mr. Watt, Mr A. Cross, 58.
Time allotted to.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 10*, 57.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1158–1164, 1166.

Egypt
Administration—Reform Proposals.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 17*, 1038.
Cairo Drainage Scheme.
Q. Mr. J. M. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 23*, 1774.
Committee of Public Safety for, proposed.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 17*, 1037.
Testamentary Dispositions of British Subjects.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. K. Hardie, *Nov. 10*, 25.

Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill
Effect on Schedule II., Clause 39, of Code.
Q. Mr. Joynson-Hicks; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *Nov. 11*, 280.
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Clough, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. A. J. Balfour; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 561.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 891.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1071.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 19*, 1374.
Qs. Mr. A. Douglas, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Joynson-Hicks, Mr. Forster, Lord R. Cecil, Sir W. Anson; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1432.

Elementary Education (England and Wales) (No. 2) Bill
c. 1R.* *Nov. 20*, 1578.
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Lord E. Talbot, Mr. Belloc; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 23*, 1084.

Ellis, Rt. Hon. T. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Hooley, E. T.—Financial Transactions in Wife's Name, alleged, *Nov. 18*, 1224.
Income-Tax Statistics (1906–7), *Nov. 10*, 28.
Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1630, 1631.

Ely Estate
Case of E. McBrien.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
Evicted Tenants and Purchase of Land.
Qs. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 19*, 1382.

Embankment
See Thames Embankment

Emigrants' Information Office
Grant to.
Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19*, 1399.

Emigration
Assisted Passages
Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 10*, 43.
Number in 1907.
Q. Mr. J. Collings; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19*, 1370.

Enfield
Sentence passed on Man for Fowl-stealing.
Q. Mr. Branch; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 10*, 21.

Ennis
Quarter Sessions—Case of M. Hogan.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1421.

Enniscorthy
Vaccination Defaulters.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1427.

Erroll, Earl of
Army—Proposals as to teaching Trades, *Nov. 16*, 837.
Moray Firth Trawlers, Damage done to Line Fisheries by, *Nov. 11*, 241, 242.

Essex [Chelmsford]
Parliamentary Election—New Writ, *Nov. 18*, 1196.

Essex, Mr. R. W. [Gloucestershire, Cirencester]
Gloucestershire, Small Holdings, *Nov. 10*, 42; *Nov. 12*, 547.
Old-Age Pensions—Calculation of Income of Married Couples, *Nov. 12*, 513.

Evans, Sir S. T.—*Solicitor-General* [Glamorgan, Mid]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 727–735, 755 761, 765, 784, 795, 796; *Nov. 16*, 982–, 985, 994–996, 1002–1004; *Nov. 17*, 1086–1092, 1121, 1139, 1140, 1154, 1157, 1158; *Nov. 18*, 1243–1250, 1254, 1258, 1264, 1269, 1290, 1311, 1329–1336; *Nov. 19*, 1438, 1448, 1460, 1475–1483, 1485, 1487, 1488, 1499, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1517–1523, 1525, 1527, 1528, 1532; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1612.

Eversley, Lord
Moray Firth, Trawling in
British Vessels prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 223, 229.
Bye-Laws, Operation of, *Nov. 11*, 220–224.
Foreign Trawlers, Policy as to, *Nov. 11*, 222.

Evicted Tenants Act, 1907
Appeals, Procedure in dealing with.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 287.

Evictions, Ireland
See under Ireland.

Faber, Capt. W. V. [Hampshire, Andover]
Army—One-Pounder Quick-firing Guns in use, *Nov. 11*, 250.
Indian Army
Poona Officers' Quarters, *Nov. 19*, 1388.
Strength, *Nov. 18*, 1212, 1213.
Lunacy, Prohibition of Marriage of Persons temporarily in Asylums, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 271.
Rosyth Works, Date of Completion, *Nov. 11*, 263.
Tar Macadam Roads, Cost of, etc., *Nov. 17*, 1048.
Unemployment
Percentage of Work done, *Nov. 11*, 277.
Register of Applicants, Form of, *Nov. 17*. 1046; *Nov. 18*, 1206.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
"Coach and Horses" Public-house, Terms of Sale by the War Office, *Nov. 17*, 1085.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 735–740; *Nov. 16*, 898–903; *Nov. 17*, 1080–1086, 1156; *Nov. 18*, 1291; *Nov. 19*, 1464–1469.
Names of Commissioners, *Nov. 19*, 1402.
Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 305, 317.

Factories
Inspectors
Appointment of.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 16*, 870.
Number of.
Q. Mr. King; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 19*, 1372.
Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1185.
Witnesses ordered to attend, etc., *Nov. 12*, 457.

Farrell, Mr. J. [Longford, N.]
Clonguish Band—Disturbance on 12th Inst. *Nov. 23*, 1753.
Davoren Estate Sale Proposals, *Nov. 23*, 1752.
Longford, Telephone Extension to, *Nov. 23*, 1801.
Monydanagha—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 23*, 1753.
Tuberculosis Prevention Bill, Provisions of, *Nov. 23*, 1752.

Farrer, Lord
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 493.

Feeble-minded Persons
Royal Commission, Cost of.
Q. Sir J. Tuke; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 16*, 879.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Admiralty Contracts, Number placed with Messrs, J. S. White, *Nov. 11*, 262.
Consols, Foreign Investors in, *Nov. 17*, 1060.
Fiscal Policy of International Trade, Reason for Publishing, etc., *Nov. 19*, 1379, 1429; *Nov. 23*, 1779.
Hepburn-on-Tyne—Depth of Water over the Sills of Messrs. Stephenson's Dock, *Nov. 17*, 1030.
India—Burial of Kanai Lal Dutt after hanging, *Nov. 16*, 866, 867.
Invergordon Naval Base, Proposals for, *Nov. 11*, 261.
Investments Abroad—Estimate (1900–7), *Nov. 12*, 537, 538; *Nov. 17*, 1060.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 783; *Nov. 18*, 1285–1286.
Navy
"Dreadnought" Type—Docks available on East Coast, *Nov. 11*, 262.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers, Speed and Cost of, *Nov. 23*, 1764.
Niger Delta, Payment of Fines and Currency used, *Nov. 11*, 265.
Nigeria—Spirit Imports, *Nov. 17*, 1034; *Nov. 19*, 1397.
Old-Age Pensions—Applications received *Nov. 12*, 513, 514; *Nov. 17*, 1055.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 443; *Nov. 12*, 677, 678.
Transvaal Mine Labour Circulation of Minute, *Nov. 16*, 869.
United States *Bulletin*—Articles on Wages and Food, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 112, 118, 129–131, 137, 142, 147, 170, 177.

Fermanagh
Vaughan's Charity School, Management of. *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1759.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.
Clonelly—Land Available for Evicted Tenants, *Nov. 19*, 1382.
Ely Estate
Case of E. McBrien, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
Evicted Tenants and Purchase of Land, *Nov. 19*, 1382, 1383.
Poor Law, Ireland—Valuation of Licensed Houses, *Nov. 19*, 1363.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Civil Service Assistant Clerks, Memorial from, *Nov. 10*, 25.
Constabulary Clothing Contracts, Control of, *Nov. 23*, 1762.
Fermanagh—Management of Vaughan's Charity School, *Nov. 23*, 1759.
Gambling in Futures, etc., Stamp Tax on Time Bargains, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 259.
Old-Age Pension Claims, Procedure in Dealing with, *Nov. 11*, 255, 256.
Ordnance Survey—Private Work by Officials, *Nov. 10*, 26.
Post Office
Parcel Post, Baskets for Irish Service. *Nov. 11*, 251; *Nov. 12*, 502.
Stores Contracts, Allocation of, *Nov 23*, 1756.
Works Board—Labourers' Wages, *Nov. 10*, 25.

Finance Act
Section 6, Effect of Refusal to Administer. *Q.* Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 10*, 27.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanarkshire, N.E.]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 796; *Nov. 17*, 1144.
Old-Age Pensions
Officers, Assistance to, *Nov. 20*, 1571,
Voluntary Filial Payments, *Nov. 20*, 1572,

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Fiscal Policy of International Trade
Memorandum Ordered, and Presented, *Nov. 11*, 247.
Reason for Publishing and Opportunity for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1379.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1429.
Qs. Mr. Gibb, Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23*, 1779.

Fisheries
[*See also Names of Places, Rivers, etc.*]
Scottish New Cruiser.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 10*, 51.

Fitmaurice, Lord—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Moray Firth, Trawling in.
British Vessels Prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 237–239.
Foreign Trawlers, Policy as to, *Nov. 11*, 235–238.

Fitzpatrick Estate
Case of Mr. J. McSweeney.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1429.

Fletcher, Mr. J. S. [Hampstead]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1257–1259.

Florists
Application of Factory Act to.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 23*, 1780.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Afforestation Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 233.
Derinagree—Case of D. O'Connell, *Nov. 20*, 1572.
Evicted Tenants Act, 1907—Appeals, Precedure in Dealing with, *Nov. 11*, 287.

Food and Drugs Act
Administration in Scotland (1905–7).
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 23*, 1795.

Foot and Mouth Disease
American Outbreaks.
Os. Lord Kenyon, Earl Carrington, *Nov. 19*, 1361.
Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1411.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1755.
Qs. Mr. Stanier; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1793.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Mr. T. McKinnon Wood.

Foreshores
Leasing of.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1019.

Forest Gate
Station Road—Tradesmen's Stalls.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 16*, 869.

Forestry
Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 10*, 56.
Ireland
Afforestation Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 11*, 283.
Landlords' Powers to cut down Timber.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *Nov. 19*, 1411.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
Education—Government Proposals for Effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1435.
Old-Age Pensions—Board paid by Son or Daughter to Aged Parent, Reckoning of, *Nov. 17*, 1056.
Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill Date of taking Committee Stage, *Nov. 19*, 1553.

Fort Fergus
Cattle-drive on 13th inst.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1420.

Forth and Clyde Canal
Scheme for.
Qs. Sir G. S. Robertson, Mr. Watt, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1767.

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Derbyshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1384.

France
Customs Tariff Reports, Date of Issuing.
Q. Mr. James Hope; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 38.
Limes and Lemons, Import Duty on.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 17*, 1043.
Lyons Consular District—Report Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009.
Rentals, Holders of.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1570; *Nov. 23*, 1775.

Friendly Islands
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009.

Fuge Estate
Templemary Portion, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 53.

Galway
Constabulary—Extra Force.
Qs. Mr. Hazleton; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1364, 1425, 1426.
Land Purchase Statistics.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1799.

Gambling in Futures, etc.
Stamp-tax on Time Bargains, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 259.

Germany
Alcoholic Liquors, Duty on.
Qs. Mr. C. Roberts, Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. T. McKinnon Wood, *Nov. 11*, 268.
Naval Shipbuilding Programme.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Dr. Macnamara, *Nov. 10*, 35.

Gibb, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Harrow]
Fiscal Policy of International Trade. Information as to, *Nov. 23*, 1779.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
Rifle Clubs, Ammunition Supply, *Nov. 19*, 1381.

Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Administration—Correspondence Presented, *Nov. 11*, 213, 247.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork County, W.]
Castletown Bere Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 16*, 885, 886.
Dursey Island, Sale Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 885.
Land Purchase
Agreements, Effect of Proposed Legislation on Dealing with, *Nov. 18*, 1207.
Transactions to Date, *Nov. 11*, 294.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
Charitable Donations and Bequests—Commissioners and Report, *Nov. 10*, 29, 30,
Civil Service Estimates, Subhead A, Vote 32, Class 2, Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1020, 1062.
Crown Jewels, Loss of, *Nov. 17*, 1063, 1064.
Dublin State Library, Founding of, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 32.
Irish Land Bill, Provisions of, *Nov. 17*, 1064.
Irish Universities Bill—Payments under Section 6, *Nov. 12*, 503.
Local Government Board
Audit System, *Nov. 17*, 1026, 1027.
Auditors, Qualifications of, *Nov. 17*, 1026.
Malone Estate—Cases of Taafe and Ballesty, etc., *Nov. 10*, 34.
National School Teachers' Fees, Payment of, *Nov. 10*, 33.
Phibbs Estate Sale Proposals, *Nov. 19*, 1418.
Riverstown
Disturbance on 29th ult., *Nov. 19*, 1414, 1418, 1424; *Nov. 23*, 1796.
Postmaster, Allegations against, *Nov. 18*, 1231; *Nov. 23*, 1801.

[*cont.*

Ginnell, Mr. L.—*cont.*

Smythe Estate—Case of Mrs. Riggs, *Nov. 17*, 1064.

Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill, Abandonment of, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 33.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]

Aberdare—Case of D. Evans, *Nov. 11*, 271.

Aliens Act Administration, making more strict, proposed, *Nov. 16*, 870.

Bristol University Charter, *Nov. 20*, 1574.

Enfield—Sentence passed on Man for Fowl-stealing, *Nov. 10*, 22.

Factory Inspectors

Appointment of, *Nov. 16*, 870.

Number of, *Nov. 19*, 1372.

Florists, Application of Factory Act to, *Nov. 23*, 1780.

Forest Gate—Station Road, Tradesmen's Stalls, *Nov. 16*, 870.

Home Office Orders No. 806–809, Trades consulted before issuing, *Nov. 19*, 1373.

Home Rule—Identity of Irish American Visitors, *Nov. 16*, 871, 872.

Juvenile Offenders, Number in Prison, *Nov. 17*, 1022.

Licensing Act, 1904 — Compensation awarded since 1906, *Nov. 11*, 248.

Licensing Bill—Names of Commissioners, *Nov. 19*, 1402.

London—Ambulances at Police Stations (1891–1907), *Nov. 12*, 518.

Lunacy, Prohibition of Marriage of Persons Temporarily in Asylums, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 271

Members of Parliament—Police Protection at Private Residences, *Nov. 16*, 845.

Middlesex Sessions—Case of A. Jones, *Nov. 17*, 1039.

Murders—Metropolitan Statistics(1903–8), *Nov. 16*, 840.

Northallerton Quarter Sessions—Flogging administered to Incorrigible Rogue, *Nov. 17*, 1040.

Parkhurst Prison, Baths provided, *Nov. 18*, 1213.

Parliament—Approach by the Embankment, *Nov. 23*, 1780.

Pentonville Prison—Case of W. Williams, *Nov. 18*, 1214.

Petrol Storage—Prevention of Accidents, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 10*, 42.

Prerogative of Mercy, Rule governing Use of, *Nov. 11*, 252.

Prisoners, Books and Writing Materials permitted to, *Nov. 17*, 1042.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*

Rate, General—Return of Commitments for Non-Payment, proposed, *Nov. 23*, 1780.

"Taunton"—Charge against Crew, *Nov. 11*, 272.

Thames Embankment Motor Traffic, Regulation of, *Nov. 19*, 1373.

Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison treatment

Pankhurst, Mrs. and Miss, Case of, *Nov. 17*, 1041.

Power of Home Secretary, etc., *Nov. 11*, 252, 253 ; *Nov. 17*, 1040, 1041 ; *Nov. 18*, 1202, 1203

Gloucestershire

Small Holdings.

Q. Mr. Essex ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 10*, 42.

Q. Mr. Essex ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 547.

Q. Mr. H. Beach ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1410.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1313–1315.

Gooch, Mr. H. C. [Camberwell, Peckham]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 142.

Gold Coast Colony

Railway Rates on Spirits.

Q. Mr. Armitage ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 263.

Gooseberry Mildew

Measures for dealing with.

Qs. Mr. Hardy ; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 510.

Removal of Affected Bushes.

Q. Mr. Rowlands ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1406.

Government Contracts

Fair Wages Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report.

Q. Mr. Steadman ; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 16*, 880.

Return ordered, *Nov. 19*, 1362.

Granard, Earl of

Naval Reserve Officers—Conditions of granting New Decoration, *Nov. 11*, 245, 246.

War Instructions issued to Merchant Ships, *Nov. 10*, 20.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]

Army — Territorial Force Infantry Armourer-Sergeants, Pay of, *Nov. 12*, 515.

Greenock
- Admiralty Purchase of portion of Estate—Valuation of remainder.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 12*, 501.
- Torpedo Factory—Discharge of Workmen.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1391.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
- Juvenile Offenders, Number in Prison, *Nov. 17*, 1022.

Grenfell, Lord
- Army
  - Organisation of, as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1726–1729.
  - Territorial Force, Value of, as a Fighting Force, *Nov. 23*, 1725.
- Defence of the Empire
  - Compulsory Military Training, proposed, *Nov. 23*, 1729, 1730.
  - Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1725.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Rutland]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 750–752; *Nov. 16*, 908–912, 985–987; *Nov. 17*, 1110–1114, 1162, 1163, 1164; *Nov. 18*, 1326–1329; *Nov. 19*, 1436–1446, 1457, 1514.
- Naval Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 19*, 1390.
- Special Reserve Enlistment Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 516.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
- Anthrax, Precautions against Importation, *Nov. 11*, 251.
- Belgium Colonial Minister, Identity of, *Nov. 10*, 39.
- China—Fa-ku-men Railway, Withdrawal of Japanese Protest against, *Nov. 10*, 41.
- Congo Free State
  - Belgian Annexation—Present Position, *Nov. 10*, 40.
  - British Consular Reports, *Nov. 10*, 38.
  - Forced Labour—Belgian Attitude, *Nov. 10*, 40.
  - Mission Sites, Guarantees as to, *Nov. 10*, 40.
- Egypt
  - Administration—Reform Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1038.
  - Committee of Public Safety for, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1037, 1038.
- French Customs Tariff Reports, Date of issuing, *Nov. 10*, 38.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- International Naval Conference, Constitution and Terms of Reference, *Nov. 10*, 41.
- Persia
  - British and Russian Subjects in Persian Service, Recall of, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 41.
  - Constitution—Promulgation of Rescript, *Nov. 12*, 534.
- Russia—British Subjects visiting, Case of Mr. J. Edelstein, *Nov. 17*, 1037.
- Soudan—Operations against Tilul Basran Tribes, *Nov. 18*, 1201.
- "Taurus" Steam Trawler, Arrest by German Gun-boat, *Nov. 12*, 533.
- United States Bonded Goods—Provision in Treaty of Washington, *Nov. 12*, 532.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 116, 126.

Gun Trade
- Proof-Marking of Imports.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 536.

Gwynn, Mr. S. L. [Galway]
- Connaught Winter Assizes, Place of holding, *Nov. 16*, 888.
- Land (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—Inclusion of Fishery Rights, proposed, *Nov. 16*, 884.

Hackney Marshes
- Model Yacht Lake, Scheme for.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Brooke; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 11*, 278; *Nov. 19*, 1369.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Barracks with One-room Married Quarters in occupation, *Nov. 16*, 864.
- Bradford, Postmaster-General's Visit to, anticipated Disturbance during, *Nov. 12*, 515.
- Carlow Barracks, Condition of, *Nov. 16*, 863, 864.
- Christchurch Sewerage Scheme, *Nov. 16*, 849.
- Cork Barracks—Discharge of Artisans and Labourers, *Nov. 11*, 258; *Nov. 18*, 1231.
- Curragh Camp
  - Beresford Barracks, Condition of, *Nov. 16*, 865.
  - Officers' Quarters, *Nov. 16*, 863.
  - Quarters for Army Service Corps, *Nov. 10*, 36, 37.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 114, 199.
- Guns, One-pounder Quick-firing, in use, *Nov. 11*, 250.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Horses
  - Remount Department, Excess in, *Nov. 17,* 1032.
  - Welsh Purchases, *Nov. 10,* 34.
- Indian Army—Strength, *Nov. 18,* 1213.
- Irish Command—Constitution of 6th Division, *Nov. 16,* 864.
- Officers—Examination of Candidates for Commissions, *Nov. 10,* 36.
- Parkhurst Barracks, Baths in, *Nov. 18,* 1212.
- Reserves residing Abroad, Statistics as to, *Nov. 19,* 1381.
- Rifle Clubs, Supply of Ammunition to, *Nov. 18,* 1211, 1212; *Nov. 19,* 1382.
- South African War—Case of A. A. Reynolds, *Nov. 10,* 35.
- Special Reserve
  - Enlistment Statistics, *Nov. 12,* 516.
  - Officers, Employment of, *Nov. 23,* 1755.
  - Suffolk Regiment Third Battalion, Training of, *Nov. 23,* 1770.
- Territorial Force
  - Horses available, Reports on, *Nov. 17,* 1031.
  - Infantry Armourer Sergeants, Pay of, *Nov. 12,* 515.
  - Medals, Grant for, *Nov. 19,* 1388.
  - Shooting, Prizes for, *Nov. 19,* 1387.
  - Shooting Ranges in Scotland, Caretakers of, *Nov. 19,* 1381.
  - Uniform provided, *Nov. 11,* 259.
- War Office
  - Boot Contracts and Prices, *Nov. 12,* 516, 517.
  - Foreign Firms, Articles ordered from, *Nov. 16,* 841, 863.
  - Headquarters Staff—Revision proposed, *Nov. 23,* 1769.
  - Historical and Literary Department, *Nov. 23,* 1769.
  - Nosebags—Patent Rights of Mr. J. Bielefeld, *Nov. 16,* 849.
- Wiltshire, Small Holdings on War Office Land, *Nov. 16,* 865, 866.
- Wiltshire, Private A., Case of, *Nov. 23,* 1771.
- Woolwich Tramway Improvement Scheme, *Nov. 16,* 849.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Doolin—Disturbance on 18th ult., *Nov. 16,* 886.
- Kilmaleg, Rent of M'Gann's Land, *Nov. 12,* 548.
- Liscannor Harbour, Condition of, *Nov. 19,* 1412.

Halsbury, Earl of
- Children Bill, *Rep., Nov. 12,* 465, 469, 470, 487.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord
- Deck Cargoes carried in Winter-time, *Nov. 10,* 19, 20.

Hammersmith
- Poor Law Guardians, Land purchased by. *Q.* Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19,* 1385.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- House of Commons—Press Accommodation, *Nov. 11,* 299; *Nov. 16,* 879.
- Law Courts, Extension Proposals, *Nov. 19,* 1376; *Nov. 23,* 1788.
- Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 16,* 977.
- Parliament—Medicine Chest, Arrangements for, *Nov. 16,* 878.
- Regent's Park Lake, Cleansing of, *Nov. 12,* 520.
- Serpentine, Cleansing of, proposed, *Nov. 16,* 879.

Harcourt, Mr. R. (Montrose Burghs)
- Bell Rock, Trawling near, *Nov. 13,* 713.
- Black Scab Outbreaks, *Nov. 19,* 1405, 1406; *Nov. 20,* 1573.
- Herrings, Close Time for, proposed, *Nov. 17,* 1025.
- Old-Age Pensioners residing Abroad, *Nov. 23,* 1777.
- Small Holdings
  - Applications received, *Nov. 18,* 1217.
  - Houses and Buildings, Schemes for, *Nov. 18,* 1217.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Aberdare—Case of D. Evans, *Nov. 11,* 271.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 19,* 1436.
- Canada—Information as to Deported Persons, *Nov. 10,* 25.
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours No. 2) Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 23,* 1803.
- Education (Provision of Meals) Act
  - Levy of Rate—Cases sanctioned, *Nov. 20,* 1575.
  - Section 3, Applications under, *Nov. 19,* 1373.
- Egypt—Testamentary Dispositions of British Subjects, *Nov. 10,* 25.
- India
  - Midnapur Case, *Nov. 19,* 1392, 1393, 1394.
  - Punjab Judgeships, Appointments to, *Nov. 16,* 867, 868.
- Merthyr Tydvil Unemployment Grant, *Nov. 10,* 43, 44.

[*cont,*

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
- Navy—Cause of Shipwright's Death on "Diadem," *Nov. 19*, 1389.
- North British Railway Company Employees, Civil Rights of, *Nov. 17*, 1071, 1072.
- North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 17*, 1183.
- Pentonville Prison—Case of W. Williams, *Nov. 18*, 1214.
- Post Office Christmas Work
  - Applications received, *Nov. 10*, 45.
  - Telegraph Messengers, Duties of, *Nov. 18*, 1214.
- South African War—Case of A. A. Reynolds, *Nov. 10*, 35.
- Unemployment Grant
  - Administration of, *Nov. 23*, 1776.
  - Supplementary Grants, System of applying, *Nov. 11*, 270.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
- Suffolk, West—Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1200.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Black Scab, Measures for preventing Spread of, *Nov. 12*, 510.
- Gooseberry Mildew, Measures for dealing with, *Nov. 12*, 510, 511.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- India Office Contracts and Fair Wages Clause, *Nov. 17*, 1033.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1094–1098.
- Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims, *Nov. 17*, 1038.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
- Foreshores, Leasing of, *Nov. 17*, 1019.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 906–908.

Harris, Mr. F. L. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
- Admiralty Liquor Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 520, 521, 522.
- Merchant Shipping Act, 1906, Application to Foreign Vessels, *Nov. 12*, 536.
- Trinidad Governor, Appointment of, *Nov. 11*, 250.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
- Civil Service Supply Association, Management of, *Nov. 11*, 253.
- India—Baroda Education System, *Nov. 11*, 263.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 779; *Nov. 17*, 1151; *Nov. 19*, 1496, 1515.
- Persian Constitution—Promulgation of Rescript, *Nov. 12*, 534.

Harvey, Mr. W. E [Derbyshire, N.E.]
- Hooley, E. T.—Financial Transactions in Wife's Name, Alleged, *Nov. 18*, 1223.

Haversham, Lord
- Army
  - Recruits, Character and Quality of, *Nov. 16*, 828.
  - Trades, Proposals for Teaching, *Nov. 16*, 828, 829.

Haworth, Mr. A. A. [Manchester, S.]
- Cotton Trade—Sliding Scale for Wages, proposed, *Nov. 12*, 535.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- Land Purchase
  - Advances, Information as to, *Nov. 10*, 24.
  - Bonus distributed, *Nov. 10*, 24.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
- Worcester Quarter Sessions—Fees of Shorthand Writers, *Nov. 12*, 519.

Hazleton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
- Galway Constabulary—Extra Force, *Nov. 19*, 1364, 1425, 1426.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 905.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 781.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
- Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1634–1643.
- Old-Age Pensions—Instructions as to Secrecy, *Nov. 19*, 1377.
- Unemployment
  - Distress Committees
    - Applications refused, *Nov. 18*, 1203.
    - Circulation of List, *Nov. 16*, 873.
  - Poor Relief—Discrepancy between Statement of Prime Minister and Local Government Board Order, *Nov. 12*, 539, 540, 640–644.
- Wellington (Som.)—Administration of Old-Age Pensions Act, *Nov. 19*, 1377.

Henderson, Mr. J. M. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
- "Coach and Horses" Public-house—Terms of Sale by the War Office, *Nov. 17*, 1109.
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1105–1110.

Heneage, Lord
- Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 465.
- Moray Firth, Trawling in
  - British Vessels prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 213–220, 229, 234, 243.
  - Bye-laws relating to, Operation of, *Nov. 11*, 215–220.
  - Foreign Trawlers, Policy as to, *Nov. 11*, 217.
  - Line Fisheries, Damage done to, *Nov. 11*, 216.

Henry, Mr. C. S. [Shropshire, Wellington]
Bills, Suggestion for Carrying over to next Session, *Nov. 17*, 1069.
Education (Provision of Meals) Act—Adoption by Local Authorities, *Nov. 17*, 1048.

Hepburn-on-Tyne
Depth of Water over the Sills of Messrs. Stephenson's Dock.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1030.

Herbert, Col. Sir I. [Monmouthshire]
Wiltshire, Private A., Case of, *Nov. 23*, 1770, 1771.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
Small Holdings
Dismissal of Applicants by Employers, Cases of, *Nov. 11*, 297.
Dorsetshire Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1405.

Herrings
Close Time for, proposed.
Q. Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 17*, 1025.

Herschell, Lord
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 498.

Hilsea
"Coach and Horses," Sale of by the War Office.
Qs. Mr. G. D. Faber, *Nov. 17*, 1085; Mr. J. M. Henderson, 1109.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hampshire, New Forest]
Crown Lands, Work for Unemployed on, *Nov. 17*, 1052.
New Forest Road Repair, Proposals for, *Nov. 17*, 1052.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Bristol, E.]
Beer
Brewers paying Duty on less than 500 Barrels, *Nov. 11*, 254.
Ingredients, List of, *Nov. 10*, 49.
Licensed Holders Brewing and Selling their own Beer, *Nov. 11*, 254.
Bryansford, Pension Officer for, *Nov. 11*, 254
Carnadoe Creamery Drainage Disposal, *Nov. 16*, 854.
Civil Service
Assistant Clerks, Memorial from, *Nov. 10*, 25.
Boy Clerks, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16*, 852.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*cont.*
Civil Service—*cont.*
Examination System, *Nov. 23*, 1792.
Second Division Clerks promoted in 1908, *Nov. 23*, 1789.
Civil Service Supply Association, Management of, *Nov. 11*, 253.
Colonial Securities—Facilities for Small Investors, *Nov. 10*, 48.
Consols, Foreign Investors in, *Nov. 17*, 1060.
Crown Lands, Work for Unemployed on, *Nov. 17*, 1053.
Customs and Excise
Abstractor Clerks, Pensions of, *Nov. 19*, 1372; *Nov. 23*, 1792.
Overtime in Statistical Department, *Nov. 17*, 1055.
Superintendents
Classification of, *Nov. 17*, 1059.
Promotion of, *Nov. 23*, 1749.
Devonport Naval Engineering College—Pension of Master, *Nov. 11*, 281.
Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners, Old-Age Pensions paid by, *Nov. 17*, 1061.
Estate Duty
Office Staff, Grievances of, *Nov. 10*, 46; *Nov. 17*, 1053, 1054; *Nov. 23*, 1788, 1789.
Scottish Payments—Effect of Gunning Case, *Nov. 10*, 47.
Feeble-minded Persons—Cost of Royal Commission, *Nov. 16*, 880.
Foreshores, Leasing of, *Nov. 17*, 1021.
Government Contracts Fair Wages Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, *Nov. 16*, 880.
Horse-Breeding — Grant from Imperial Funds, *Nov. 23*, 1791.
Income-Tax Repayment Branch—Salaries of Minor Staff Officers, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
Investments Abroad, Statistics as to, *Nov. 17*, 1060.
Irish Universities Bill—Payments under Section 6, *Nov. 12*, 503.
Irish Works Board Labourers' Wages, *Nov. 10*, 26.
Lunatic Pensioners in Irish Asylums, Position of, *Nov. 23*, 1800, 1801.
New Forest Road Repair, Proposals for, *Nov. 17*, 1053.
Old-Age Pensions
Age, Proof of, *Nov. 10*, 47, 48.
Aliens, Naturalised, Applications from, *Nov. 12*, 513.
Applications received, *Nov. 17*, 1056.
Board paid by Son or Daughter to Aged Parent, Reckoning of, *Nov. 17*, 1056, 1057.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*cont.*

Claims

Investigation, Time taken in, *Nov. 10*, 50.

Procedure in dealing with, *Nov 10*, 49.

Clerks to appointing Councils, Duties and Payment of, *Nov. 17*, 1058.

Delay, Proposals for obviating, *Nov. 17*, 1059.

Highlanders, Applications from, *Nov 12*, 514.

Instructions—Date of issue, *Nov. 17*, 1057.

Irish Holdings, Basis of Assessment of Income from, *Nov. 10*, 50.

Poor Relief as a Disqualification, *Nov. 12*, 513.

Poor Law, Ireland—Valuation of Licensed Houses, *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Revenue and Expenditure—Amounts issued to meet Capital Expenditure, *Nov. 23*, 1760.

South African War, History of—Pay of Officers employed, *Nov. 23*, 1760.

Superannuation

Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 26, *Nov. 17*, 1061.

Section 7 of Act—Financial Limits on Treasury Powers, *Nov. 23*, 1790.

Tobacco growing in Scotland, Encouragement of, *Nov. 17*, 1055.

University College Grants—Report of Committee, *Nov. 19*, 1385.

Worcester Quarter Sessions—Fees of Shorthand Writers, *Nov. 12*, 519.

Hodge, Mr. J. [Lancashire, S.E., Gorton]

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1255–1257.

Holland, Sir W. H. [Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham]

National Telephone Company Employees, Position of, *Nov. 12*, 545.

Holt, Mr. R. D. [Northumberland Hexham]

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 401, 404, 423–425, 429; *Nov. 12*, 658, 668, 672, 673, 682, 706, 709, 711.

Holycross

Attack on Mr. Clarke's House.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1754.

Home Office

Secretary of State—Right Hon. H. Gladstone.

Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.

Orders No. 806–809, Trades consulted before issuing.

Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 19*, 1373.

Home Rule

See under Ireland.

Hooley, E. T.

Financial Transactions in Wife's Name, alleged.

Qs. Mr. W. E. Harvey, Mr. Ellis; *As.* Sir W. Robson, *Nov. 18*, 1223.

Hop Industry

Beer, *see that title.*

Legislative Proposals.

Qs. Sir W. J. Collins, Mr. Rowlands; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 10*, 28.

Production Statistics.

Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 11*, 254.

Hope, Mr. James [Sheffield, Central]

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 82–85, 157, 164, 179, 193, 211.

French Customs Tariff Reports, Date of Issuing, *Nov. 10*, 38.

Indian Railway Screw Contract, Allocation of, *Nov. 19*, 1394.

Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 740–743; *Nov. 17*, 1136–1143; *Nov. 18*, 1276, 1307–1310; *Nov. 19*, 1472–1475.

Subsection (2) of New Clause, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16*, 893.

Hope, Mr. W. H. B. [Somerset, N.]

Old-Age Pensions—Definition of Eligibility, *Nov. 23*, 1758.

Horses

Army, *see that title.*

Breeding—Grant from Imperial Funds.

Q. Mr. W. Roch; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1790.

Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill

l. 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1192; *Nov. 19*, 1353.

Housing and Town Planning Bill

Legal Attendance on Committee.

Qs. Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12*, 541.

Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1072.

Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 23*, 1802.

Howard, Mr. G. [Cumberland, Eskdale]

Cumberland Surrendered Licences, Payment to County Council for, *Nov. 11*, 270.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]

Underground Electric Railway Companies—Proposals for Conciliation Boards, *Nov. 12*, 538.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Aliens Act Administration—Making more Strict, proposed, *Nov. 16*, 870.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 19*, 1511.
Meat, Imported—Foreign Inspection Systems, *Nov. 16*, 876, 877.
Navy—Torpedo-boat Destroyers.
Oil Fuel, Use of, *Nov. 23*, 1766.
Speed and Cost of, *Nov. 16*, 860; *Nov. 23*, 1764, 1766.
Post Office Engineers' Branch, Revision of Provincial Office Clerical Force, *Nov. 16*, 850.

Hyde, Mr. C. G. [Wednesbury]
Postage on Circulars, *Nov. 12*, 517.

Imperial Institute
Report (1906–7) Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 838.

Income-Tax
Clergy Liability.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
Employers' Contributions towards Workpeople's Pensions, Liability of.
Q. Mr. Vivian; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
Repayment Branch—Salaries of Minor Staff Officers.
Q. Mr. E. H. Lamb; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
Separate Return for Wales, proposed.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
Statistics (1906–7).
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 10*, 28.

India
Administration—Reform Proposals.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 12*, 526.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1392.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Army
Pension System.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 16*, 868.
Poona Officers' Quarters.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1388.
Promotion of Officers, System of.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 11*, 257.
Strength.
Qs. Captain Faber, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 18*, 1212.
Baroda Education System.
Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 11*, 263.

India—*cont.*
Bombay Education Standard—Government Resolution.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 12*, 525.
Burdwan, Maharajah of—Appreciation of Courage during Attack on Lieut.-Governor of Bengal.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 12*, 528.
Chaibasa, Treatment of Geological Students at.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Kanai Lal Dutt, Burial of, after hanging.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 16*, 866.
Liquor Trade—Method of ascertaining Local Opinion.
Q. Sir H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 17*, 1032.
Midnapur Case.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Rees, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1392.
Nundo Lal Bannerjee, Assassination of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 16*, 846.
Prisoners—Operation of Amnesty.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 12*, 527.
Proclamations of Queen Victoria and King Edward Presented, *Nov. 13*, 713.
Punjab Judgeships, Appointments to.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 16*, 867.
Railway Screw Contract, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. James Hope; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1394.
Sedition, Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Simla—Boundary of Penrose Estate.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 23*, 1762.
Trade Review (1907–8) Presented, *Nov. 11*, 213, 247.

India Office
Secretary of State—Right Hon. Viscount Morley.
Under-Secretary—Right Hon. T. R. Buchanan.
Contracts and Fair Wages Clause.
Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 17*, 1032.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *Nov. 17*, 1033.

Industrial Diseases
Compensation for—Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.

Infantile Mortality
See under Deaths.

Infectious Diseases

Notification—Medical Views.
  Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 506.

International Naval Conference

Constitution and Terms of Reference.
  Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 41.

Invergordon

Naval Base, Proposals for.
  Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 261.

Investments Abroad

Estimate (1900–7).
  Qs. Mr. Fell, Sir F. Banbury; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 537.

Statistics as to.
  Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1060.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Right Hon. A. Birrell.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Right Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General.—Mr. R. Barry.

[*For particular Places, Estates, etc., see their Names.*]

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Departments, *see that Title.*

Assizes, Winter—Orders in Council, Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.

Cattle-Driving
  Procedure in dealing with arrested Persons.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 11*, 285.
  Treatment of certain Prisoners.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 19*, 1425.

Charitable Donations and Bequests—Commissioners and Report.
  Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 29.

Condition of.
  Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 553.
  Outrages not reported.
    Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 551.

Constabulary, *see that Title.*

Crimes—Return Presented, *Nov. 11*, 247.

Crown Jewels, Loss of.
  Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1063.

Education, *see that Title.*

Evictions
  Bourke, J. J., Case of.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1795.

Ireland—*cont.*

Evictions—*cont.*
  Maher, Mrs. M., Case of.
    Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 19*, 1383.
  Mulgrew, P., Case of.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1763.
  Procedure in effecting Reinstatements.
    Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1414.
  Return Presented, *Nov. 12*, 457, 500.

Firearm Traffic—Inquiry proposed.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1422.

Firing Outrages—Report by Aggrieved Persons.
  Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 291.

Home Rule—Identity of Irish American Visitors.
  Qs. Captain Craig, Earl Winterton, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 871.

Land Acts, Land Commission, Land Judges Court and Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

Newspaper—Warning as to Insertion of Certain Notices.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 290.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1420.

Police, *see* Constabulary and Dublin—Metropolitan Police.

Poor Law, *see that title.*

Royal University—Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 3.

Works Board—Labourers' Wages.
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 25.

Irish Land Bill

c. Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1806.
  1R.* *Nov. 23*, 1916.

Debate on Introduction (Commons), *Nov. 23*, 1806.
  Act of 1903, Terms and Financial Provisions of, 1807–1813, 1848, 1901–1907, 1909.
  Afforestation, Proposals for, 1832, 1836, 1892.
  Bonus, Proposals as to, 1814, 1819–1822, 1842–1844, 1847, 1857, 1867, 1875.
  Congested Areas, 1823, 1824–1837, 1894–1897.
  Congested Districts Board
    Compulsory Acquisition of Land, Powers as to, 1828, 1866, 1876, 1877, 1881, 1894.
    Financial Proposals, 1818, 1827, 1828, 1838, 1855, 1877, 1878, 1883, 1908.

[*cont.*

Irish Land Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Introduction (Commons)—*cont.*
Congested Districts Board—*cont.*
Powers Transferred to Board of Agriculture, 1828.
Purchase Work of, 1816.
Reconstitution of, 1827, 1838, 1881, 1882.
Estates Commissioners
Compulsory Powers for Acquisition of Land, 1833, 1835.
Financial Proposals, 1818.
Purchase Work of, 1816, 1840, 1841.
"Future Tenants," Position of, 1832. 1833, 1835.
Land Policy of the Government, 1807,
Loans, Temporary, Powers for, 1818,
Pending Agreements, Position of, 1814–1816, 1818, 1865, 1872.
Price of Land, Method of Valuation for, 1829, 1830.
Sale of Land
Amount of Land Available and Estimate of Cost, 1850–1855, 1873, 1884, 1910, 1911.
New Rules for, 1831, 1832.
Stock
Amount still to be Raised, and Price of Issue, Estimate of, etc., 1813, 1814, 1884–1888.
Imperial Exchequer to bear Losses of Flotation, 1817, 1818, 1839, 1840, 1847, 1856, 1858, 1859, 1888, 1904.
Issues since 1903, Losses on, etc., 1811–1813.
New Issues, Proposals as to, 1818, 1842, 1843.
Untenanted or Grass Land, Proposals for Compulsory Acquisition of, 1825–1827, 1866, 1875, 1876, 1883, 1889, 1890, 1897, 1898, 1913.
Zones, Proposals as to, 1830, 1836, 1907.
Excluded Tenants, Claims of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 291.
Fishery Rights, Inclusion of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 884.
Proposals for passing into Law this Session.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *Nov. 23*, 1844, 1845; Mr. Wyndham, 1846; Mr. W. O'Brien, 1862, 1864; Mr. Birrell, 1914.
Provisions of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1064.
Second Reading, Date of.
Os. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1915.

Irish Universities Bill
Charters, Date of issuing.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1419.
Section 6, Payments under.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse. *Nov. 12*, 503.

Iron and Steel
Import and Export Statistics (1907).
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 11*, 272.
Royalty in United Kingdom and certain Foreign Countries.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 17*, 1045.

Isaacs, Mr. R. D. [Reading]
Old-Age Pensions—Provision as to Income from Sick Pay, *Nov. 23*, 1757.

Japan
Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 11*, 213.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1277.
Tobacco—Encouragement of Scottish Cultivation, *Nov. 17*, 1055.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
Navy
"Diadem"—Cause of Shipwright's Death, *Nov. 19*, 1388, 1389.
Dockyards
Employment Statistics, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
Petitions from Workmen, *Nov. 19*, 1391.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Admiralty Liquor Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 522.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 756–759; *Nov. 16*, 931, 933; *Nov. 17*, 1114–1120, 1144, 1149; *Nov. 18*, 1327; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1609.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvon, Arfon]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1237.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Bradford—Anticipated Disturbance during Postmaster-General's Visit, *Nov. 12*, 515.
Post Office Christmas Work, Men eligible for, *Nov. 19*, 1367.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Ballinacurra Sewerage Scheme, *Nov. 11*, 294.
Limerick Council Borrowing Powers, *Nov. 12*, 557.
Orange Lodges in South Antrim, *Nov. 12*, 552.
Pilots—Clyde Pilot Case, *Nov. 12*, 547, 548.

Joynson-Hicks, Mr. [Manchester, N.W.]
Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill.
Effect on Schedule 2, Clause 39 of Code, *Nov. 11*, 280.
Government Proposals for effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1434.

Judicial Statistics
Scotland — Report Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 839.

Juvenile Offenders
Number in Prison.
Q. Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 17*, 1022.

Kavanagh, Mr. [Carlow]
Irish Land Bill, *Intro.*, *Nov. 23*, 1881–1884.

Kearley, Sir H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Devonport]
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R., *Nov. 17*, 1181–1184.

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 344, 353–355, 420, 421, 447; *Nov. 12*, 583–593, 605, 647, 671, 674, 675.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Civil Service Boy Clerks, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16*, 852.
Post Office
Christmas Work, Men Eligible for, *Nov. 19*, 1368.
Leave of Absence, Decision as to, *Nov. 17*, 1018.

Kenmare
Fair Rent Hearings.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 556.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 23*, 1797.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
Nigeria—Liquor Traffic Inquiry, *Nov. 11* 265.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Cavan Evicted Tenants, Land Available for, *Nov. 12*, 504, 551.
Crookenden and Casey Estate—Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 12*, 551; *Nov. 17*, 1067.
Food and Drugs Act—Scottish Administration, *Nov. 23*, 1795.
Railways — Irish Commission Sittings, *Nov. 19*, 1424.
Thomastown Estate Untenanted Land, Acquisition of, *Nov. 17*, 1068.

Kent
Small Holdings
Applications.
Q. Mr. Rowlands, *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 12*, 508.
Land Available for.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1793.

Kenyon, Lord
Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreak in Pennsylvania, *Nov. 19*, 1361.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
Education
Inspectors, Appointment of, *Nov. 23*, 1799.
Intermediate
Grants and Examination Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
Inspectorate, *Nov. 10*, 55; *Nov. 18*, 1226.
Rules, Discussion of, *Nov. 12*, 559.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 99, 100.
Evictions—Case of P. Mulgrew, *Nov. 23*, 1763.
Foot and Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Nov. 19*, 1411.
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1888, 1912.
Land Act, 1903—Number of Tenants Remaining to be dealt with, *Nov. 23*, 1748.
Old-Age Pensions
Appeals, Method of Dealing with, *Nov. 11*, 287.
Basis of Assessment of Income from Irish Holdings, *Nov. 10*, 50.
Claims, Procedure in Dealing with, *Nov. 10*, 49.
Irish Appointment of Officials, *Nov, 11*, 296.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Cork Land Purchase Prices, etc., *Nov. 23*, 1798.

Killea
United Irish League Meeting.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 550.

Kilmaine, Baron
Representative Peers for Ireland—Right to Vote Claimed, *Nov. 12*, 457; *Nov. 17*, 1009; *Nov. 18*, 1185.

Kilmaleg
Rent of M'Gann's Land.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 548.

King, Mr. A. J. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
  Factory Inspectors, Number of, *Nov. 19*, 1372.
  Penny Postage with United States, Returns as to, *Nov. 19*, 1368.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
  Army Territorial Force—Uniform provided, *Nov. 11*, 259.
  Indian Army—Promotion of Officers, *Nov. 11*, 257.

Kinnaird, Lord
  Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 473.
  Nurses Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 5.

Lacken
  Outrage at Cushen's House.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 550.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrew, E.]
  Ceylon
    Colombo
      Government Workshops and Private Work, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
      Graving Dock
        Ship Repairs by the Government, *Nov. 10*, 37.
        Workshops, Contract for, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
      Wesley College Estimates, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
    Public Works System, *Nov. 10*, 37.
  Crown Colonies with Government Workshops undertaking Private Business, *Nov. 17*, 1034.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
  Income-Tax Repayment Branch—Salaries of Minor Staff Officers, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 369–371, 404–406, 439, 442; *Nov. 12*, 695.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 170.
  Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1621.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 143.

Lanarkshire
  Education Grant.
    Q. Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 19*, 1376.

Land (Ireland) Act, 1903
  Bonus Distributed.
    Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 24.
  Number of Tenants remaining to be dealt with.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1748.

Land Judge's Court
  Estates in—Return Presented, *Nov. 13*, 713.

Land Purchase (Ireland)
  [*For particular Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
  Advances
    Information as to.
      Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 24.
      Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 52.
    Return Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 839.
  Agreements, Effect of Proposed Legislation on dealing with.
    Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1207.
  Fund, Proposals as to.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1432.
  Present Position—Effect of Projected Legislation.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 848.
    Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 889.
  Transactions to Date.
    Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Gilhooly; *As.* Mr. Birrell. *Nov. 11*, 292.
    Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 883.
    Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1229.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1751.
  Untenanted Land, Distribution of.
    Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 54.
    Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 55.

Land Transfer Acts
  Royal Commission, Scope of.
    Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *Nov. 11*, 251.
  Rules and Fee Order Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1678, 1745.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash]
  Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill—Attendance of Law Officer, *Nov. 23*, 1802, 1803.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 978; *Nov. 18*. 1263–1265, 1283.
    Definition of Meal, *Nov. 19*, 1431.
  Old-Age Pensions
    Charitable Pensions, Reckoning of, *Nov. 18*, 1213.
    Clerks, Pay of, *Nov. 23*, 1778, 1779.
    Poor Relief as a Disqualification, *Nov. 16*, 875; *Nov. 23*, 1764.
  Unemployment—Afforestation Schemes Carried out, *Nov. 16*, 875.

Lansdowne, Marquess of

- Army
  - Organisation as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1734, 1735.
  - Territorial Force—Value as a Fighting Force, *Nov. 23*, 1734.
- Bills, Precedence for—Suspension of Standing Order No. XXI., *Nov. 18*, 1190, 1191.
- Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 462, 470, 496
- Defence of the Empire
  - Adequacy of Present System, *Nov. 23*, 1730.
  - Invasion, Possibility of and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1731–1736.
- Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Nov. 18*, 1196.
- Moray Firth—British Trawlers prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 224–228.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]

- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 321–327, 351–353, 393, 394, 426, 439; *Nov. 12*, 600–606, 667, 670, 697, 699, 700, 701.
- Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1585, 1643–1653.

Law Courts

- Extension Proposals.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 19*, 1376; *Nov. 23*, 1787.

Layland-Barratt, Mr. F. [Devon, Torquay]

- Army Territorial Force Medals, Grant for, *Nov. 19*, 1387.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]

- Admiralty Liquor Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 521.
- Members of Parliament—Police Protection at Private Residences, *Nov. 16*, 845.
- Pacific Phosphate Company, Report on Allegations against, *Nov. 12*, 530, 532.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 421.

Leader Estate

- Case of Mrs. A. Nagle.
  - *Q.* Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 558.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hants, Fareham]

- Navy
  - Shipbuilding Programme, Information as to, *Nov. 19*, 1390.
  - Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Speed and Cost of, *Nov. 23*, 1764, 1765, 1766.
  - Two-Power Standard, Definition of, *Nov. 12*, 560; *Nov. 23*, 1768.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]

- Natal Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter, *Nov. 19*, 1396.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 455.

Liberia

- Copyright Convention, Accession to, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1017; *Nov. 18*, 1186.

Licensing Act, 1904

- Compensation awarded since 1906.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitbread; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11*, 247.
- New Licences granted.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *Nov. 12*, 535.

Licensing Bill

- *c. Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 727; *Nov. 16*, 893; *Nov. 17*, 1073; *Nov. 18*, 1232; *Nov. 19*, 1436.
  - 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1578.
- *l.* 1R.* *Nov. 20*, 1569.
- Clubs—Government Amendments proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Clough; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1070.
- Commissioners, Names of.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. D. Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 19*, 1402.
- Debates on Consideration [Commons], *Nov. 13*, 727; *Nov. 16*, 893; *Nov. 17*, 1073; *Nov. 18*, 1232; *Nov. 19*, 1436; and Third Reading, *Nov. 20*, 1578.
  - *Bona fide* Traveller, Restrictions on Sale of Liquor to, 1241, 1242, 1248, 1249, 1253–1255, 1258, 1262, 1270, 1274, 1275, 1286, 1309, 1312, 1324.
  - Clause 3, Omission of, proposed, 893, 903, 906, 923.
  - Clause 10, Omission of, proposed, 1073, 1086.
  - Clause 18, Omission of, proposed, 1232, 1238.
  - Clause 20, Omission of, proposed, 1307, 1313.
  - Clause 24, Omission of, proposed, 1436, 1451, 1452.
  - Clause 36, Omission of, proposed, 1494.
  - Clause 37, Omission of, proposed, 1504.
  - Clubs
    - "Drinking" Club, Definition of, 1504–1508, 1510–1528, 1531–1534.
    - Local Stipendiary Magistrates to Deal with, 1499–1501.
    - Military and Naval Clubs and Messes, Exemption of, proposed, 1515, 1521–1526.
    - Notice of Objections, Modification of Provisions as to, proposed, 1506–1509.
    - Registration, Annual Renewal of, 1494–1498, 1501–1504.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- Debates on Consideration (Commons)—*cont.*
  - Clubs—*cont.*
    - Restrictive Measures, Proposals as to, 1273, 1276, 1284, 1592–1594, 1613, 1614, 1632, 1646, 1647.
  - Compensation
    - Allocation between Owner and Tenant, 904, 1111, 1125–1129, 1139, 1140, 1163, 1164, 1167.
    - Annual Value of Licence, Method of Arriving at, 943, 1139.
    - Basis of, 1073–1078, 1080–1168, 1587, 1588, 1597, 1598.
    - "Market Value" as Basis, proposed, 1075, 1078, 1082, 1091, 1105–1109, 1118, 1121, 1125, 1134, 1137, 1152–1160, 1454, 1465.
    - Position of Licensed Houses at Expiration of Time-limit, 1586, 1587.
  - Confiscatory Measure, alleged, 1596–1602, 1655.
  - Election Days, Closing of Public-Houses on, 801, 1312, 1321, 1334, 1335, 1626.
  - Government Amendments, 805, 807, 952, 955, 959, 961, 965, 969, 973, 1007, 1172, 1177, 1178, 1181, 1303, 1342, 1345, 1347, 1351, 1493, 1538, 1541, 1545, 1546, 1549, 1550, 1553.
  - "Home-brew" Houses, Position of, 1104, 1105.
  - Licences
    - Assumption of Right of Renewal, 919, 936, 937, 1074, 1584, 1620, 1621, 1650, 1651.
    - Freehold Tenure, Allegations as to, 906, 907, 909, 912, 922, 925–928, 934–936, 1583, 1585.
    - Grocers' Licences, Position of, 899–901, 932, 979–981, 989–996.
    - Monopoly Value, *see that Sub-heading.*
  - Licensed Houses—Basis of Valuation, 1076, 1077, 1082–1086, 1091–1094, 1101–1103, 1110–1115, 1147, 1148, 1151, 1439–1451, 1454–1456, 1460–1462, 1467, 1468, 1472, 1473, 1479–1482.
  - Licensing Justices
    - Appeal from Decisions of, Provision for, 1079.
    - Discretionary Powers as to Reducing Licences, 996–1004.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- Debates on Consideration (Commons)—*cont.*
  - Local Veto, Proposals for, 899, 903, 917–919, 930–932, 941, 1629, 1630, 1639.
    - Small Parishes, Grouping of, 904, 940, 941.
    - Two-Thirds Majority, 905, 930.
  - "Meal," Definition of, 739, 741, 753, 754, 765, 777, 796.
  - Monopoly Value
    - Definition of, 914, 940, 1091, 1124, 1135, 1436–1439, 1451–1455, 1458, 1459, 1461–1490, 1588–1590, 1622.
    - Off-Licences, Position of, 977, 978, 981, 983–990.
    - Resumption of, by the State, 909, 910, 912, 914, 924, 926, 942, 1456, 1457, 1582, 1608, 1619.
  - Off-Licences
    - New Licences, Conditions to be attached to, 988–996.
    - Provision for separate Sale of Liquor and other Commodities, proposed, 988–996.
    - Reasons for Exclusion of, 928, 940, 943, 944, 980, 981, 982, 1632.
  - On-Licences—Powers of Justices to attach Conditions to Renewal, 1307–1338.
  - Opening of Public-Houses prior to 8 a.m., Prohibition of, proposed, 1314, 1319, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1336.
  - Rejection of Measure, proposed, 1596, 1607.
  - Shareholders, Position of, 946–948, 1603, 1604.
  - Statutory Reduction of Licences, 894–898, 901, 911, 939, 1129, 1580, 1581, 1596, 1617, 1618, 1635.
    - Scheme for carrying out — Duties of Licensing Authorities, 996–1004.
  - Sunday Opening — Curtailment of Hours, 728, 744, 769, 793, 1233–1292, 1311.
    - Hotels and Restaurants, Application to, 728, 729, 736, 1258.
    - Hours of Opening, Powers of Magistrates as to, 1289–1292, 1296, 1299.
    - Metropolis, bringing within the Scope of the Bill, 1267, 1278, 1280.
    - Monmouthsire, Extension of Sunday Closing to, 1238, 1243, 1246, 1247, 1252, 1255, 1256, 1259–1262, 1270, 1272, 1274, 1281, 1282, 1286, 1309.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- Debates on Consideration (Commons)—*cont.*
  - Sunday Opening—*cont.*
    - Sale of Provisions other than Alcohol during prohibited Hours, 727–799, 1240, 1264, 1277, 1285.
    - Unlicensed Refreshment Houses, Position of, 749, 790.
  - Temperance, Effect on, 1606, 1608–1614, 1616, 1643, 1645, 1646, 1649, 1654, 1656.
  - Time-Limit — Extension to Twenty-one Years, 899, 904, 910, 912–914, 923, 928, 937, 945, 1074. 1081, 1087, 1124, 1125, 1130, 1602.
- Inn-Keeper's Duties, Definition of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 893.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Courthope, Mr. H. P. Pease, Mr. Meysey-Thompson; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1431.
- Meal, Definition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1431.
- Report Stage — Motion for Allocation of Time (Mr. Asquith), *Nov. 11*, 301.
- Subsection (2) of New Clause, Proposals as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. S. Wortley, Mr. James Hope; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 892.
- Tied-Houses, Proposals for Abolishing.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Mackarness, Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. A. J. Balfour; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 559.

Lights and Lighthouses
- Expenditure on (1894–5 and 1905–8).
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 23*, 1760.

Limerick
- Council borrowing Powers.
  - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 557.

Limpsfield
- School Accommodation.
  - *Q.* Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 17*, 1025.

Linlithgow, Marquess of
- Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *Nov. 12*, 457.

Liquor Traffic
- Beer, *see that Title.*
- Licensing Statistics (1900–8).
  - *Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *Nov. 12*, 535.

Liscannor Harbour
- Condition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1412.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* (Carnarvon Boroughs]
- Bank of England—Notes Written off, *Nov. 23*, 1777.
- Beer Ingredients, List of, *Nov. 10*, 23.
- British South Africa Company—Government Guarantee of Loan, *Nov. 12*, 520.
- Consols—Facilities for Small Investors, *Nov. 20*, 1570; *Nov. 23*, 1775, 1776.
- Cumberland Surrendered Licences, Payment to County Council for, *Nov. 11*, 270.
- Death Duties—Separate Returns for Wales, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
- Fiscal Policy of International Trade
  - Information as to, *Nov. 23*, 1779.
  - Reason for Publishing, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
- French Rentes, Holders of, *Nov. 20*, 1570; *Nov. 23*, 1775, 1776.
- Gambling in Futures, etc.—Stamp Tax on Time Bargains proposed, *Nov. 11*, 259.
- Hop Industry—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 29.
- Income-Tax
  - Clergy Liability, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
  - Employers' Contributions Towards Workpeople's Pensions, Liability of, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
  - Separate Returns for Wales, proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
  - Statistics (1906–7), *Nov. 10*, 28.
- Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1847.
- National Debt—Assets of Definite Cash Value, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Accounts of Committees, Audit of, *Nov. 12*, 514.
  - Charitable Pensions, Reckoning of, *Nov. 18*, 1213.
  - Claims, Procedure in Dealing with, *Nov. 11*, 255, 256.
  - Clerks, Pay of, *Nov. 23*, 1778, 1779.
  - Committees, Formation of, *Nov. 23*, 1761.
  - Foreigners' Widows, Eligibility of, *Nov. 19*, 1387.
  - Income from Irish Small Farm, Calculation of, *Nov. 18*, 1207.
  - Instructions, Authority for Issuing, *Nov. 19*, 1379.
  - Irish Appointment of Officials, *Nov. 11*, 296.
  - Married Couples, Calculation of Income of, *Nov. 12*, 513.
  - Officers
    - Assistance to, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
    - Supervision of, *Nov. 19*, 1378.
    - Work of—Case of H. Mortished, *Nov. 11*, 269, 270.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
  - Regulations
    - Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed, *Nov. 19,* 1560–1563.
    - Arrangements for Tabling and Discussing, *Nov. 19,* 1565, 1566.
    - Article 25, Amendment of, *Nov. 18,* 1205.
  - Residence, *Nov. 18,* 1200; *Nov. 23,* 1778.
  - Secrecy, Instructions as to, *Nov. 19,* 1377.
  - Voluntary Filial Payments, *Nov. 20,* 1572.
  - Wife of Person in Receipt of Poor Relief, *Nov. 19,* 1379.
- Old-Age Pensions Act—Extension to Naval and Military Pensioners in Channel Islands proposed, *Nov. 11,* 257.
- Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11,* 332–335, 351, 433, 434; *Nov. 12,* 595. 697, 699, 700, 701.
- Superannuation — Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 20,* 1571.
- Taxation—Statistics for Great Britain and Certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 10,* 27.
- Unemployment
  - Grant
    - Administration of, *Nov. 23,* 1776.
    - Amount Unexpended, *Nov. 20,* 1572.
  - Supplementary Grants, System of Applying, *Nov. 11,* 270, 271.
- Wellington (Som.)—Administration of Old-Age Pensions Act, *Nov. 19,* 1378.

Local Authorities
- Assets, Basis of Estimating in Return.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12,* 540.
- Borrowing Powers, Application of Sinking Funds in Exercise of—Select Committee of Inquiry Appointed, *Nov. 11,* 456.

Local Athorities (Admission of the Press) Bill
- *l.* Report from Standing Committee, *Nov. 10,* 3.
  - *Rep., Nov. 17,* 1011.

Local Government Board
- *President*—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. C. F. G. Masterman.
- Loans, Particulars of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19,* 1370.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
- Audit System.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17,* 1026, 1027.
- Auditors, Qualifications of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17,* 1026.

Local Government (Scotland) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *Nov. 23,* 1916.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill
- Standing Order No. XXXVIII.—Motion to Dispense with (Lord Atkinson), *Nov. 17,* 1010.

Lockwood, Rt. Hon. Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
- Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11,* 432, 433.

London
- Ambulances at Police Stations (1891–1907).
  - *Q.* Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 12,* 518.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill
- *c. Rep.* *Nov. 18,* 1196.

Londonderry, Marquess of
- Bills, Precedence for—Suspension of Standing Order No. XXI., *Nov. 18,* 1190.

Long, Col. C. W. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
- Army Territorial Force, Shooting Prizes for, *Nov. 19,* 1387.

Long, Rt. Hn. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
- Channel Fleet—Strength on 23rd September, *Nov. 12,* 524, 525.
- Irish Land Bill, *Intro., Nov. 23,* 1820, 1908–1914.

Longford
- Labourers' Cottages—Loan Application.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Phillips; *A.* Mr. Birrell *Nov. 11,* 286.
- Telephone Extension to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 23,* 1801.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid]
- Black Scab—Measures for Dealing with Irish Outbreak, *Nov. 16,* 882.
- Cattle-driving
  - Procedure in Dealing with Arrested Persons, *Nov. 11,* 285, 286.
  - Treatment of Certain Prisoners, *Nov. 19,* 1425, 1426.
- Clare, Moonlighting Outrages in, *Nov. 23,* 1750.
- Congested Districts Board, Land held by, etc., *Nov. 16,* 847.
- Corbehagh—Outrage at house of Cummins, *Nov. 18,* 1225

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*

Ennis Quarter Sessions—Case of M. Hogan, *Nov. 19*, 1421, 1422.

Firearm Traffic—Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1422.

Firing Outrages—Report by Aggrieved Persons, *Nov. 11*, 291.

Fort Fergus—Cattle-Drive on 13th Inst., *Nov. 19*, 1420, 1421.

Holycross—Attack on Mr. Clarke's House, *Nov. 23*, 1754.

Irish Land Bill—Date of Second Reading, *Nov. 23*, 1915.

Land Purchase

Fund, Proposals as to, *Nov. 19*, 1432.

Present Position—Effect of projected Legislation, *Nov. 16*, 848.

Transactions to Date, *Nov. 18*, 1230, 1231; *Nov. 23*, 1751.

Lunatics—Deportation in Ireland, *Nov. 23*, 1754.

Marlborough St. Training College — Residential Quarters, *Nov. 19*, 1421.

Navy

Rosyth, Provision for Expenditure on, *Nov. 23*, 1768.

Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 16*, 862.

Newspapers—Warning as to Insertion of certain Notices, *Nov. 11*, 290; *Nov. 19*, 1420.

Riverstown

Boycotting in District, *Nov. 18*, 1224.

Disturbance on 29th Ult. *Nov.*, *19*, 1417.

Postmaster, Allegations against, *Nov. 18*, 1232.

Towerhill Cattle-Drive on 7th Inst., *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Tulleroan Disturbance on 10th Inst., *Nov. 19*, 1427.

Lord Chamberlain

Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor

Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice

Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain

Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council

Viscount Wolverhampton.

Lord Privy Seal

Earl of Crewe.

Loreburn Lord—*Lord Chancellor*

Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 470, 484, 486.

Defence Resolution, *Nov. 23*, 1742.

Housing of the Working Classes (Ireland) Bill, 3R. *Nov. 18*, 1193–1195.

Post Office Consolidation Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 19*, 1359, 1360.

Lough, Right Hon. T. [Islington, W.]

Port of London—Shipping Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 503.

Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 360, 431, 433; *Nov. 12*, 567–585, 611, 621, 668, 669, 673, 676, 678, 680, 683, 686, 691.

Clause 3, Hour for taking, *Nov. 11*, 298.

Lovat Lord

Defence of the Empire

Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23*, 1696–1704.

Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1697–1704.

Navy as first Line of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1702, 1703.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. T. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]

[*For Rulings as Speaker, see Titles*, Speaker *and* Questions.]

Lucas, Lord—*Under Secretary of State for War*

Recruiting—Character and Quality of Men recruited, *Nov. 16*, 830.

Soldiers—Proposals for Teachers of Trades *Nov. 16*, 830–832.

Territorial Force.

Home Defence, Employment for, *Nov. 16*, 830, 836.

Permanent Staff

Reduction in Number of, *Nov. 16*, 813, 814.

Re-posting to Regiments—Powers of Commanding Officers, *Nov. 16*, 814–817.

Lunacy

Deportation of Lunatics in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1754.

Marriage of Persons temporarily in Asylums, Prohibition of, proposed.
Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11*, 271.

Pensioners in Irish Asylums—Allocation of Deductions.
Qs. Captain Donelan Mr. W. Abraham; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1800.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
  Castleconnell—Funeral of Mr. Enright, *Nov. 12*, 549.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
  Cancer—Death Rate in Ireland, *Nov. 12*, 505.
  Enniscorthy Vaccination Defaulters, *Nov. 19*, 1427.
  Forth and Clyde Canal Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1767.
  Housing and Town Planning Bill—Legal Attendance at Proceedings, *Nov. 17*, 1072.
  India
    Army—Strength, *Nov. 18*, 1213.
    Kanai Lal Dutt, Burial of, after Hanging, *Nov. 16*, 867.
  Infant Mortality Statistics, *Nov. 12*, 507.
  Infectious Diseases Notification —Medical Views, *Nov. 12*, 506.
  Licensing Bill, *Con*., *Nov. 13*, 776; *Nov. 17*, 1098, 1100
  Runcorn — Case of Mr. Johnson's Child, *Nov. 12*, 507; *Nov. 19*, 1371.
  Small Holdings — Register of Applications, proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1219.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
  Cape Colony Stamp and Licences Act, Provisions of, *Nov. 12*, 517.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 752, 793, *Nov. 16*, 993.
  Navy—Devonport Engineering College Master, Pension of, *Nov. 11*, 281.

Lynch Mr. H. F. B. [Yorkshire, W.R. Ripon]
  Persian Constitution — Promulgation of Rescript, *Nov. 12*, 534.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 19*, 1449.

McArthur Mr. C. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 435–437.

McCallum, Mr. J. [Paisley]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 18*, 1282, 1283; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1629.

McCrae, Sir G. [Edinburgh, E.]
  Edinburgh — Dispute between Town Council and Distress Committee, *Nov. 11*, 282, 283.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 117.
  Postal Officials — Travelling Allowances, *Nov. 20*. 1574.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk Burghs]
  Egypt—Cairo Drainage Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1774.
  Naval Two-power Standard, *Nov. 23*, 1768, 1769.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
  Copyright Conference, Alterations Proposed by, *Nov. 23*, 1782.
  Factory Inspectors, Appointment of, *Nov. 16*, 870.
  Florists, Application of Factory Act to, *Nov. 23*, 1780.
  Home Office Orders No. 806–809, Trades Consulted before Issuing, *Nov. 19*, 1373.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 19*, 1509–1511.
  Post Office Christmas Work—Rate of Pay, *Nov. 12*, 543.

M'Gillicuddy Eager Estate
  Evicted Tenants, Position of.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1419.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
  Licensing Act, 1904—New Licences Granted, *Nov. 12*, 535.
  Licensing Bill—Proposals for Abolishing Tied Houses, *Nov. 12*, 559.
  Navy
    Expenditure—Statistics for United Kingdom and certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 18*, 1208.
    Strength—Comparison with certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 23*, 1746.
    Two-power Standard, *Nov. 16*, 862.
  Navy Estimates—Votes in United Kingdom and certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 16*, 859.
  Small Holdings—Reports on Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1222.

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* [Monmouth, N.]
  Admiralty
    Contracts
      British Articles, Purchase of, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
      White, Messrs. J. S., Number Placed with, *Nov. 11*, 262.
    First Sea Lord, Pay of, *Nov. 16*, 853.
    Granite Contracts, *Nov. 17*, 1030.
    Liquor Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 521, 522, 523.
  Australasian Naval Defence Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 861.
  Battleships Refit—Time Occupied on certain Vessels, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
  "Bulwark," Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
  Canada—Defence of Esquimault, *Nov. 16*, 856, 857.
  Channel Fleet—Strength on 23rd September, *Nov. 12*, 524, 525.
  Coastguard Changes, Procedure in Effecting, *Nov. 17*, 1025.

[*cont.*

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*cont.*
  "Diadem"—Cause of Shipwright's Death, *Nov. 19*, 1388, 1389.
  Dockyards
    Employment Statistics, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
    Extra Men, Conditions of Employing, *Nov. 18*, 1211.
    Foreign Workmen Employed, *Nov. 12*, 523.
    Pay System, *Nov. 16*, 860.
    Petitions from Workmen, *Nov. 19*, 1391; *Nov. 23*, 1761.
  "Dreadnought" Type—Docks Available on East Coast, *Nov. 11*, 262.
  Dundee—Suitability for Naval Base, *Nov. 19*, 1390.
  Estimates—Votes in United Kingdom and certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 16*, 859, 860.
  Expenditure—Statistics for United Kingdom and certain Foreign Countries *Nov. 18*, 1208.
  Forth and Clyde Canal Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1767, 1768.
  Greenock Torpedo Factory—Discharge of Workmen, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
  Hepburn-on-Tyne — Depth of Water over the Sills of Messrs. Stephenson's Dock, *Nov. 17*, 1030.
  "Hindustan," Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
  Home Fleet — Crews of Ships, *Nov. 12*, 523.
  Invergordon Naval Base, Proposals for, *Nov. 11*, 262.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1128–1136.
  Peterhead Harbour Works—Discharge of Workmen, *Nov. 19*, 1392.
  Pilots — Clyde Pilot Case, *Nov. 18*, 1200.
  Portland Recreation Ground, Labour employed on, *Nov. 19*, 1389.
  Portsmouth—Code of Working Rules for Navvies, *Nov. 11*, 261.
  Repairs—Allocation of Contracts, *Nov. 11*, 261.
  Rosyth Works
    Bonus to Contractor, *Nov. 11*, 261.
    Capacity of Dock, *Nov. 11*, 262.
    Date of Completing, *Nov. 16*, 857, 858.
    Expenditure on, Method of providing for, *Nov. 23*, 1768.
    Progress made with, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
  Shipbuilding Programme
    Allocation of Contracts, *Nov. 16*, 859.
    Information as to, *Nov. 19*, 1390.
  Strength — Comparison with certain Foreign Countries, *Nov. 23*, 1746.
  Submarines — Number to be laid down, *Nov. 17*, 1028.

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*cont.*
  Telephone Service—Value of Coast Communication, *Nov. 11*, 260.
  Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
    Contract Speed, *Nov. 16*, 855, 856, 860.
    Oil-Fuel, Use of, *Nov. 23*, 1766.
    Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1028, 1029.
    Speed and Cost of, *Nov. 23*, 1765, 1766, 1767.

McLaren, Mr. H. D. [Staffordshire, W.]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 609–612.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 774–776; *Nov. 16*, 923.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J., *Secretary to the Admiralty* [Camberwell, N.]
  Admiralty Timber Contracts—Method of calling for Tenders, *Nov. 12*, 508.
  Dockyards—Selection of extra Men, *Nov. 10*, 36.
  German Naval Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 10*, 35.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
  Ballyshannon Postal Facilities, *Nov. 12*, 502; *Nov. 23*, 1746.
  Prerogative of Mercy, Rule governing Use of, *Nov. 11*, 252.
  Rhodesia
    Native Labour Bureau, *Nov. 23*, 1773, 1774.
    Poll-Tax System, *Nov. 23*, 1772.
  Soudan Operations against Tilul Basran Tribes, *Nov. 18*, 1201.
  Women's Suffrage Movement — Prison Treatment, Power of Home Secretary, etc., *Nov. 11*, 252; *Nov. 18*, 1202, 1203.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
  Bank of England—Notes Written off, *Nov. 23*, 1776, 1777.
  Black Scab Outbreak, *Nov. 19*, 1412.
  Bryansford, Pension Officer for, *Nov. 11*, 253.
  Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 64–66, 205–207.
  Licensing Bill—Proposals for Abolishing Tied Houses, *Nov. 12*, 560.

McVeigh, Mr. C [Donegal, E.]
  Abercorn Estate—Case of S. Keys, *Nov. 16*, 854.

Macroom
  Explosions, Inquiry into.
    Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 554,

Madagascar
Labour for Transvaal Mines — Correspondence Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 838.

Magistrates
Threatening Letters in Ireland.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 552.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Copyright—Suggestion for Restriction, *Nov. 11*, 275.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10*, 110, 183, 194, 208.

Mallet, Mr. C. E. [Plymouth]
Naval Dockyards—Pay System, *Nov. 16*, 860.

Malone Estate
Cases of Taafe and Ballesty, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 34.

Manchester
Women, Unemployment Grant for.
Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19*, 1371.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 13*, 789, 790.
Motor Speed Limit
  Local Authorities' Applications, *Nov. 17*, 1018.
  Scottish Local Authorities' Powers, *Nov. 17*, 1061.

Marnham, Mr. F. J. [Surrey, Chertsey]
Surrey Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1220.

Mayo
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 882.

Meat
Imported
  American—Tabling of Regulations.
  Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 877.
  Foreign Inspection Systems.
  Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 876.
Scottish Inspection System.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 13*, 714.

Meath, Earl of
Children Bill, *Rep., Nov. 12*, 460–462, 466.

Members of Parliament
Police Protection at Private Residences.
Q. Mr. H. C. Lea; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 16*, 845.
Return as to Names, etc., Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1745.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]
Education—School Attendance Grant, *Nov. 16*, 880, 881.
Lanarkshire Education Grant, *Nov. 19*, 1376.

Merchant Shipping Act, 1906
Application to Foreign Vessels.
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 536.

Merchant Shipping
Dock Cargoes carried in Winter Time.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 10*, 18–20; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 19, 20.
War Instructions, Information as to.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 10*, 20; Earl of Granard, 21.

Merthyr Tydvil
Unemployment Grant.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 10*, 43.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Staffordshire, Handsworth]
Liquor Traffic—Obligations of Innkeepers, *Nov. 19*, 1432.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
German Naval Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 10*, 35.
Navy
  Rosyth Works, Progress made with, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
  Submarines—Number to be laid down, *Nov. 17*, 1028.
  Torpedo-Boat Destroyers — Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1028.

Middlesex Sessions
Jones, A., Case of.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 17*, 1039.

Midleton, Viscount
Army
  Organisation as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1711–1714.
  Soldiers, Proposals for teaching Trades to, *Nov. 16*, 832–834.
  Territorial Force
    Value as a Fighting Force, *Nov. 23*, 1712.
Defence
  Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23*, 1710.
  Compulsory Military Training, proposed, *Nov. 23*, 1710, 1711.
  Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1708–1710.

Milk Supply
- Analysis of Samples by London County Council.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1408.

Millstreet
- Cottage occupied by D. O'Connor.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 13*, 726.

Milner Viscount
- Army Territorial Force—Value as a Fighting Force, *Nov. 23*, 1740.
- Defence of the Empire—Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23*, 1738–1741.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanarkshire, N.W.]
- Agriculture—Establishment of Tropical Bureau, *Nov. 10*, 37.
- Edinburgh—Dispute between Town Council and Distress Committee, *Nov. 11*, 283.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 116, 118, 148–150, 158–160.
- Fisheries—Scottish New Cruiser, *Nov. 10* 51.
- French Import Duty on Limes and Lemons, *Nov. 17*, 1043.
- Navy
  - "Bulwark," Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
  - Channel Fleet — Strength on 23rd September, *Nov. 12*, 523, 525.
  - Refit — Time occupied on certain Battleships, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
- Trade Records Report—Translation of German Customs Union Rules, *Nov. 16*, 841.

Molteno, Mr. P. A. [Dumfriesshire]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 119, 120.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 19*, 1451–1458.
- Unemployment
  - Distress Committees — Number appointed, *Nov. 16*, 873.
  - Returns of Proceedings of Distress Committees, *Nov. 16*, 873.

Monydanagha
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1753.

Monkswell, Lord
- Army
  - Recruiting
    - Character and Quality of Men Recruited, *Nov. 16*, 820, 821, 829, 830, 834, 835.
    - Report of Inspector-General, *Nov. 16*, 818, 820.

Monkswell, Lord—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Soldiers
    - Civil Employment on Discharge, *Nov. 16*, 823.
    - Trades, Proposals for teaching, *Nov. 16*, 818, 825–827, 832, 837.
  - Territorial Force—Employment on Home Defence, *Nov. 16*, 822, 835, 836.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Newry]
- Agriculture Department Assistance to Cattle and Horse-Breeding Schemes, *Nov. 17*, 1063.
- Constabulary — Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 289, 290; *Nov. 16*, 884, 885.
- Old-Age Pensions—Calculation of Income from Irish Small Farm, *Nov. 18*, 1206.
- Parliamentary Committee, Procedure in setting up, *Nov. 11*, 289.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
- Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1833, 1870–1881.

Moray Firth
- Trawling in
  - British Vessels prohibited in Territorial Waters.
    - *Os.* Lord Heneage, *Nov. 11*, 213–220, 229, 234, 243; Lord Eversley, 223, 229; Marquess of Lansdowne, 224–228; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 229–235; Lord Fitzmaurice, 237–239; Marquess of Salisbury, 243.
  - Bye-Laws, Operation of.
    - *Os.* Lord Heneage, *Nov. 11*, 215–220; Lord Eversley, 220–224; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 228–234; Lord Saltoun, 240.
  - Foreign Trawlers, Policy as to.
    - *Os.* Lord Heneage, *Nov. 11*, 217; Lord Eversley, 222; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 233; Lord Fitzmaurice, 235–238.
  - Line-Fisheries, Damage done to.
    - *Os.* Lord Heneage, *Nov. 11*, 216; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 232; Earl of Erroll, 241, 242.

Morocco
- Postal Cash-on-Delivery System, Facilities for.
  - *Qs.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 18*, 1215.
- Trade Report, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009

Morrell, Mr. P. [Oxon, Henley]
- Dorsetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1403.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 449–453.

Morrell, Mr. P.—*cont.*
- Radnorshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 17*, 1051.
- Small Holdings
  - Applications received, *Nov. 18*, 1217, 1218.
  - Demand for, Method of ascertaining, *Nov. 18*, 1220.
  - Register of Applications proposed, *Nov. 18*, 1218, 1219, 1223.
  - Reports on Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1221.
  - Transactions to Date, *Nov. 13*, 714.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland.]
- Dundee Post Office, Overtime in, *Nov. 12*, 500.
- North-British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R, *Nov. 17*, 1183.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 345–348, 397, 398, 415–418, 422, 428, 429, 431–433, 454; *Nov. 12*, 634–640, 645–647, 651, 680, 682, 686, 691, 701–708.

Motors
- Metropolitan Speed Restrictions.
  Qs. Mr. Bowerman; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 11*, 280.
- Speed Limit
  - Local Authorities' Applications.
    Qs. Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Myer; *As.* Mr. Burns, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 279.
    Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1018.
  - Scottish Local Authorities' Powers.
    Q. Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 17*, 1061.
- Warning Signs—Issue to Schools.
  Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Nov. 16*, 879.

Murders
- Metropolitan Statistics (1903–8).
  Q. Earl Winterton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 16*, 839.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
- Education Inspectors, Appointment of, *Nov. 23*, 1799.

Muskerry, Lord
- Merchant Shipping
  - Deck Cargoes carried in Winter Time, *Nov. 10*, 18–20.
  - War Instructions, Information as to, *Nov. 10*, 20.
- Naval Reserve Officers—Conditions of Granting New Decoration, *Nov. 11*, 244, 245.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
- Motor Speed Limit—Local Authorities' Applications, *Nov. 11*, 279.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 670.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Dublin Post Office Civilian Employees, Alleged Displacement of, *Nov. 13*, 725.
- Postmen, Auxiliary Rural—Pay in Ireland, *Nov. 16*, 840.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 373–377, 415.

Natal
- British Indians, *see that title.*
- Native Affairs—Provisions of Bill.
  Qs. Mr. Byles; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 12*, 530.
- Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter.
  Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19*, 1396.

National Debt
- Assets of Definite Cash Value.
  Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1571.

National Telephone Company
- *See under* Telephone Service.

Naval Conference
- *See* International Naval Conference.

Navy
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
- *Financial Secretary*—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.
- Battleship Refit—Time Occupied on certain Vessels.
  Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
- "Bulwark," Information as to.
  Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
- Channel Fleet, Strength on 23rd September.
  Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Long; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 12*, 523.
- Coastguards, *see that title.*
- Devonport Engineering College—Pension of Master.
  Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 11*, 281.
- "Diadem"—Cause of Shipwright's Death.
  Qs. Mr. Jenkins, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1388.
- Dockyards
  - Employment Statistics.
    Q. Mr. Jenkins; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
  - Extra Men, Selection of.
    Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Dr. Macnamara, *Nov. 10*, 35.
    Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 18*, 1211.
  - Foreign Workmen Employed.
    Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 12*, 523.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Dockyards—*cont.*
Pay System.
Q. Mr. Mallet; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 16*, 860.
Petitions from Workmen.
Q. Mr. Jenkins; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1391.
Q. Mr. O. Philipps; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1761.
'Dreadnought" Type—Docks Available on East Coast.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 262.
Expenditure
International Reduction, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 861.
Statistics for United Kingdom and Certain Foreign Countries.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 18*, 1208.
"Hindustan," Information as to.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
Home Fleet—Crews.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 12*, 523.
Portland Recreation Ground, Labour Employed on.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1389.
Repairs—Allocation of Contracts.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 260.
Reserve Officers' Decoration, Conditions of Granting.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Nov. 11*, 244, 245; Earl of Granard, 245, 246.
Rosyth Contract
Bonus to Contractor.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 261.
Capacity of Dock.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 262.
Date of Completion.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 263.
Qs. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 857.
Q. Mr. Middlemore; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1029.
Expenditure, Method of Providing for.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1768.
Loan, Issue of, proposed.
Qs. Captain Clive; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1071.
Shipbuilding Programme
Allocation of Contracts.
Qs. Mr. Steadman; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 858.

Navy—*cont.*
Shipbuilding Programme—*cont.*
Capital Ships Projected.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 862.
Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Wilkie, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Gretton; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1389.
Strength
Comparison with Certain Foreign Countries.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1746.
Two-Power Standard, *see that Subheading.*
Submarines — Number to be laid down.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1028.
Torpedo-Boat Destroyers
Contract Speed.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 855.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 16*, 860.
Oil-Fuel, Comparison with Coal.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1766.
Purchase Proposals.
Qs. Mr. Middlemore, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 17*, 1028.
Speed and Cost of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1764.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 23*, 1767.
Two-Power Standard, Definition of.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 560.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 16*, 862.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Macdonald, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 23*, 1768.

Navy Estimates
Votes in United Kingdom and Certain Foreign Countries.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 16*, 859.

Netherlands
Commerce and Finance—Report Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009.

New Forest
Road Repair, Proposals for.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1052.

New Writs and New Members Sworn
See under Parliamentary Elections.

Newnes, Mr. F. [Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw]
Nottinghamshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 23*, 1748.

Nicholls, Mr. G. [Northamptonshire, N.]
Old-Age Pensions for Wives of Persons in Receipt of Poor Relief, *Nov. 12*, 542.
War Office Boot Contracts and Prices, *Nov. 12*, 517.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Civil Service—Second Division Clerks Promoted in 1908, *Nov. 23*, 1789.
Estate Duty Office, Pay of Clerks in, *Nov. 23*, 1788, 1789.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 371–373.

Niger Delta
Payment of Fines and Currency used.
Qs. Mr. Armitage, Mr. Fell; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 264.

Nigeria
Liquor Traffic Inquiry.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 265.
Southern
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 13*, 713; *Nov. 16*, 809.
Spirit Importation.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19*, 1397.
Spirit Imports, Value of.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1034.

Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]
British South Africa Company Loan—Government Guarantee, *Nov. 12*, 520.

North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R. *Nov. 17*, 1181.

Northallerton
Quarter Sessions—Flogging Administered to Incorrigible Rogue.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 17*, 1039.

Nottingham
Railway Delivery North of York, Delay in.
O. Mr. Richardson, *Nov. 13*, 726.
Q. Mr. Richardson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 13*, 725.

Nottinghamshire
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Newnes; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1748.

Nurses Registration Bill
l. 3R., *Nov. 10*, 4.
c. 1R.*, *Nov. 17*, 1073.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid]
Roscrea Labourers' Cottages Scheme, *Nov. 19*, 1383.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Russia, British Subjects Visiting—Case of Mr. J. Edelstein, *Nov. 17*, 1036.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
Constabulary—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 289.
Cork
Army Barracks—Discharge of Artisans and Labourers, *Nov. 11*, 258; *Nov. 18*, 1231.
Condition of County, *Nov. 11*, 292.
Land Purchase Transactions, *Nov. 18*, 1227, 1229; *Nov. 23*, 1798.
Evictions—Case of Mrs. M. Maher, *Nov. 19*, 1383.
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23*, 1815, 1861–1870.
Proposals for Passing into Law this Session, *Nov. 23*, 1862, 1864.
Irish Universities Bill—Date of Issuing Charters, *Nov. 19*, 1419.
Land Purchase
Transactions to Date, *Nov. 11*, 292, 293, 294; *Nov. 16*, 889, 890; *Nov. 18*, 1229, 1230.
Untenanted Land, Distribution of, *Nov. 10*, 54.
Mayo Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 16*, 882, 883.
Parliamentary Medicine Chest, Arrangements for, *Nov. 16*, 878.
Style Park—Case of Mr. J. Coleman, *Nov. 19*, 1419.

O'Callaghan-Westropp Estate
Evicted Tenants, Position of.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 888.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 87.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
India—Treatment of Geological Students at Chaibasa, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Rhodesian Trial by Jury—Amendment of Law, *Nov. 19*, 1398.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
Carnadoe Creamery Drainage Disposal, *Nov. 16*, 853.
Clooneen Hartland Farm—Sale Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 52.
Riverstown Disturbance—Inquiry proposed, *Nov. 10*, 32.
Rooskey—Magistrates in District, *Nov. 10*, 31.

O'Leary Estate
Cases of B. Mayncham, P. Cotter and J. J. Riordan.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1423.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
Cork Land Purchase Prices, *Nov. 23*, 1799.

Old-Age Pensions
Accounts of Committees, Audit of.
Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 12*, 514.
Age, Proof of.
Qs. Mr. Black; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 47.
Aliens, Naturalised, Applications from.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 12*, 513.
Appeals, Method of Dealing with.
Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 287.
Applications Received.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1055.
Charitable Pensions, Reckoning of.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 18*, 1213.
Claims
Investigation, Time taken in.
Qs. Mr. Cullinan; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 50.
Procedure in Dealing with.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 49.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 255.
Clerks to Appointing Councils, Duties and Payment of.
Qs. Mr. H. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1057.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23*, 1778.
Committees, Formation of.
Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23* 1761.
Delay, Proposals for Obviating.
Qs. Mr. Snowden, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1058.
Eligibility, Definition of.
Q. Mr. B. Hope; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1758.
Extension of Act to Naval and Military Pensioners in Channel Islands, proposed.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 257.
Foreign Widows, Eligibility of.
Q. Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1387.
Grouping of Small Districts.
Qs. Mr. Curran; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1047.
Highlanders, Applications from.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 12*, 514.

Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
Infirmary Patients under Treatment, Eligibility of.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 56.
Instructions
Authority for Issuing.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1379.
Date of Issue.
Qs. Mr. H. P. Pease, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1057.
Ireland
Age, Facilities for Ascertaining.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1428.
Holdings, Basis of Assessment of Income from.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 10*, 50.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 18*, 1206.
Officials, Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 296.
Maintenance of Parent, Estimate of Cost of.
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1765.
Qs. Mr. Snowden, Mr. Forster; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1056.
Married Couples. Calculation of Income of.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 12*, 513.
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 874.
Officers
Assistance to.
Q. Mr. Findlay; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
Supervision of.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19*, 1378.
Work of—Case of H. Mortished.
Qs. Mr. Snowden; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 268.
Poor Relief as a Disqualification.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 12*, 513.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 875; *Nov. 23*, 1764.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19*, 1386.
Regulations
Annulment of Certain Portions, proposed.
Os. Lord R. Cecil, *Nov. 19*, 1555–1559; Mr. Bowles, 1559; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1560–1563; Mr. Cox, 1563; Sir W. Anson, 1564, Mr. H. Beach, 1565.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1764.

[*cont.*

Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
Regulations—*cont.*
Arrangements for Tabling and Discussing.
Os. Sir W. Anson, *Nov. 19,* 1564, 1565; Mr. J. Ward, 1564; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1565, 1566; Mr. S. Wortley, 1566.
Article 25, Amendment of.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 18,* 1205.
King's Answer to Address, *Nov. 10,* 1.
Residence Abroad.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 18,* 1200.
Q. Mr. R. Harcourt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23,* 1777.
Secrecy, Instructions as to.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19,* 1377.
Sick Pay, Provision as to Income from.
Q. Mr. R. Isaacs; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23,* 1757.
Voluntary Filial Payments.
Q. Mr. Findlay; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20,* 1572.
Wives of Persons in Receipt of Poor Relief, Eligibility of.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Nicholls; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12,* 542.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Captain Donelan, Mr. Rogers; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17,* 1046.
Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 19,* 1378.

Opium
Hong Kong, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. T. Taylor; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19,* 1398.
International Commission, Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. T. Taylor; *As.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 19,* 1401.
Straits Settlements Commission Report.
Q. Mr. T. Taylor; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19,* 1398.

Orange River Colony
Civil Service—British-born Persons reduced in *status.*
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 16,* 868.
Loan, Guarantee of.
Qs. Captain Clive, Captain Craig; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 17,* 1036.

Ordnance Survey
Maps—Placing Copies in County Towns, proposed.
Q. Captain Clive; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17,* 1052.
Private Work by Officials.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 10,* 26.

Oxted
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17,* 1022.

Pacific Phosphate Company
Report on Allegations against.
Qs. Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Colonel Seely, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 12,* 530.

Parker, Mr. J. [Halifax]
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 19,* 1513.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Canada—Defence of Esquimault, *Nov. 16,* 857.
Congo Free State
Belgian Annexation—Present Position, *Nov. 10,* 39.
Forced Labour — Belgian Attitude, *Nov. 10,* 40.
Mission Sites, Guarantees as to, *Nov. 10,* 40.
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 16,* 991; *Nov. 17,* 1152–1158; *Nov. 18,* 1232–1238, 1331.
Local Authorities' Assets—Basis of estimating in Return, *Nov. 12,* 540.
Meat, Imported American—Tabling of Regulations, *Nov. 16,* 877.
Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11,* 366–369, 403, 414.
Post Office — Despatch of Newspapers to North America, *Nov. 23,* 1787.
Transvaal Civil Service
Appointments, Returns as to, *Nov. 12,* 528, 529.
Command Paper 4353, *Nov. 23,* 1772.

Parkhurst Prison
Baths provided.
Q. Captain Clive; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 18,* 1213.

Parliament
Approach by the Embankment, Police Facilities afforded at.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 23,* 1780.
House of Commons
Galleries, Proposals as to Opening.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11,* 298.
Press Accommodation.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 11,* 298.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 16,* 879.
House of Lords
Representative Peers for Ireland—Right to Vote claimed by Baron Kilmaine, *Nov. 12,* 457; *Nov. 17,* 1009; *Nov. 18,* 1185.

[*cont.*

Parliament—*cont.*
  House of Lords—*cont.*
    Sat first — Marquess of Linlithgow, after the Death of his Father, *Nov. 12*, 457.
  Medicine Chest, Arrangements for.
    Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 16*, 878.

Parliamentary Elections
  New Writ—Essex (Chelmsford), *Nov. 18*, 1196.

Parliamentary Procedure
  Committee, Taking of Motion for.
    Qs. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 289, 290.
  Members of Parliament, *see that title.*

Patents and Designs Act
  Section 8—Order Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1198; *Nov. 19*, 1353.

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 589, 606–609.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
  Admiralty Granite Contracts, *Nov. 17*, 1030.
  Army Special Reserve—Training of Suffolk Regiment, Third Battalion, *Nov. 23*, 1770.
  India Office Contracts and Fair Wages Clause, *Nov. 17*, 1032.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 754, 755.
    Innkeepers' Duties, Definition of, *Nov. 16*, 893; *Nov. 19*, 1431.
  Old-Age Pensions
    Accounts of Committees, Audit of, *Nov. 12*, 514.
    Clerks to Appointing Councils, Duties and Payment of, *Nov. 17*, 1057, 1058.
    Instructions—Date of Issue, *Nov. 17*, 1057.
  Rifle Clubs, Supply of Ammunition to, *Nov. 18*, 1212.
  War Office Contracts—Articles Ordered from Foreign Firms, *Nov. 16*, 841, 862.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
  Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Bill—Date of taking Committee Stage, *Nov. 19*, 1554.

Penal Servitude Acts
  Conditional Licences Granted, *Nov. 16*, 809, 838.

Pentonville Prison
  Case of W. Williams.
    Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 18*, 1214.

Persia
  British and Russian Subjects in Persian Service, Recall of, proposed.
    Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 10*, 41.
  Constitution—Promulgation of Rescript.
    Qs. Mr. Lynch, Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 12*, 534.
  Trade Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 2.

Perth Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
  c. 1R.* *Nov. 20*, 1569.

Peterhead Harbour
  Works—Discharge of Workmen.
    Qs. Mr. Curran; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 19*, 1391.

Petrol
  Storage—Prevention of Accidents.
    Qs. Mr. P. Barlow; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

Phibbs Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1418.

Philippine Islands
  Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1678.

Philipps, Lt.-Col. J. [Southampton]
  Superannuation — Legislative Proposals' *Nov. 10*, 26.

Philipps, Mr. O. C. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
  Naval Dockyard Employees, Petitions from, *Nov. 23*, 1761.
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 441.

Phillips, Mr. J. [Longford, S.]
  Douglas Estate—Purchase of Grass Lands, *Nov. 10*, 51.
  Longford—Labourers' Cottages Loan Application, *Nov. 11*, 286.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
  Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 667.

Pilots
  Clyde Pilot, Case of.
    Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Nov. 12*, 547.
    Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 18*, 1200.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
  Education
    School Attendance Grant, *Nov. 16*, 850.
    Travelling Expenses of Departmental Officials, *Nov. 20*, 1574.

[*cont.*

Pirie, Mr. D. V.—*cont.*
    Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 146.
        Report and Third Reading Stages, Allocation of Time for, *Nov. 10*, 57.
        Time allotted to, *Nov. 10*, 57.
    Post Office Mail Service with France—Time occupied, *Nov. 12*, 544, 545.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill
    Proposals as to.
        Q. Mr. Barnard; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 10*, 42.

Police
    Ambulances, *see* London—Ambulances.
    Royal Commission—Evidence by G. Reed.
        Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *Nov. 12*, 534.

Polling Districts
    Order, altering, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009, 1017.

Poor Law
    Aged persons in receipt of Relief.
        Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 11*, 278.
        Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 11*, 283.
        Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 286.
    Deserted Wives with Children—Relief Statistics.
        Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1747.
    Ireland
        Commission Report.
            Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1763.
        Valuation of Licensed Houses.
            Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 19*, 1363.
    Relief of Dock Labour—Report Presented, *Nov. 11*, 213, 247.
    Scottish Relief Statistics.
        Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Nov. 16*, 881.
    Unmarried women with children—Relief Statistics.
        Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1747.

Poplar
    Unemployment—Schemes of work.
        Q. Mr. Brooke; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1784.

Port of London
    Shipping Statistics.
        Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov.* 12, 503.

Port of London Bill
    c. *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 321; *Nov. 12*, 567, 644. *Rep.* Nov. 12*, 712.
    Clause 3, Hour for Taking.
        Qs. Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 11*, 298.
    Discussion of.
        Q. Mr. A. J. Balfour; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 562.
    Eleven O'Clock Rule—Motion for Suspension (Mr. Asquith) *Nov. 11*, 300; *Nov. 12*, 564.
    Late Sittings, Objection to.
        Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 562.

Portsmouth
    Wages, etc.—Code of Working Rules for Navvies.
        Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 261.

Post Office
    Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
    [*See also Names of Places*].
    Christmas work
        Applications received.
            Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 10*, 45.
        Men eligible for.
            Q. Mr. Jowett; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 19*, 1367.
            Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 19*, 1368.
        Pay, Rate of.
            Qs. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Buxton, Nov. 12, 543.
    Telegraph Messengers, Duties of.
            Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 18*, 1214.
    Circulars, Postage on.
        Q. Mr. Hyde; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 517.
    City morning Delivery, Acceleration of.
        Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 545.
    Eastern Central District
        Auxiliary Postmen.
            Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16*, 877.
        Overtime of Sorters and Letter-carriers.
            Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16*, 877.
    Engineers' Branch—Revision of Provincial Office Clerical Force.
            Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16*, 850.
    Hours of duty in certain provincial offices.
        Qs. Mr. T. F. Richards; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 11*, 248; *Nov. 12*, 546.
    Leave of absence, Decision as to.
        Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 17*, 1018.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Mail Service with France — Time occupied.
Qs. Mr. Pirie ; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12,* 544.

Newspapers despatched to North America.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 23,* 1787.

Parcel Post

Baskets for Irish Service.
Qs. Mr. Field ; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 11,* 251 ; *Nov. 12,* 502.

Colonial and Foreign Amendment Warrants, Presented, *Nov. 12,* 457, 500 ; *Nov. 18,* 1186, 1197.

Penny Postage with United States, Returns as to.
Q. Mr. King ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 19,* 1368.

Postmen

Adult Night Messengers, Eligibility of.
Q. Mr. Curran ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 18,* 1215.

Auxiliary Rural—Pay in Ireland.
Q. Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16,* 840.

Pay on Transfer.
Q. Mr. Du Cros ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12,* 500.

Split Duties, Effect of Abolition of.
Q. Mr. Thorne ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12,* 542.

Stores—Allocation of Contracts.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 23,* 1756.

Towels of Clerks, Payment for Washing of.
Q. Mr. Courthope ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 16,* 850.

Travelling Allowance of Officials.
Q. Sir G. McCrae ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 20,* 1574.

Post Office Consolidation Bill

Report from Joint Committee, *Nov. 12,* 457, 563.

l. Com., Nov. 19, 1359.

*Rep.**, *Nov. 23,* 1743.

Post Office Savings Bank

Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, Presented, *Nov. 10,* 3.

Post Office Savings Bank (Public Trustee) Bill

c. 1R.*, *Nov. 17,* 1073.

Prerogative of Mercy

Rule Governing Use of.
Q. Mr. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11,* 252.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Press

Accommodation in House of Commons, *see under* Parliament — House of Commons.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]

Weekly Rest Day—Result of Inquiry, *Nov. 19,* 1401, 1402.

Prisons

Books and Writing Materials Permitted to Prisoners.
Q. Mr. Cooper ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 17,* 1042.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act, 1907

Regulations Presented, *Nov. 23,* 1679, 1744.

Questions

Argumentative, *Nov. 16,* 859, 870 ; *Nov. 19,* 1408.

Friday, Procedure in Asking on.
Q. Mr. Bottomley ; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 13,* 727.

Irrelevant, *Nov. 17,* 1041.

Matter of Opinion, *Nov. 16,* 881.

Notice to be Given of, *Nov. 11,* 263, 275, 279; *Nov. 12,* 532 ; *Nov. 16,* 856, 860 ; *Nov. 19,* 1405 ; *Nov. 23,* 1799.

Out of Order, *Nov. 12,* 550 ; *Nov. 16,* 858 ; *Nov. 18,* 1221 ; *Nov. 19,* 1426.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]

Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11,* 398–400 ; *Nov. 12,* 685.

Rate, General, Commitment for Non-Payment of—Return proposed, *Nov. 23,* 1779.

Stipendiary Curates

Position in Convocation, *Nov. 16,* 892.

Tenure of Office, *Nov. 23,* 1803.

Radnorshire

Small Holdings Applications.
Qs. Captain Clive, Mr. Morrell ; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17,* 1051.

Railway and Canal Commission

Working Agreements, Applications for Sanction to.
Mr. Wardle ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 17,* 1044.

Railways
Combines
Effect on Position of Small Shareholder.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 17*. 1043.
Powers of Board of Trade.
Q. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 11*, 275.
Irish Commission, Sittings of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1424.
North British Company Employees, Civil Rights of.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1071.
Underground Electric—Proposals for Conciliation Boards.
Qs. Mr. Hudson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 12*, 538.

Rainy, Mr. A. R. [Kilmarnock Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10*, 129.

Ramsey
Sanitary Condition, Report on.
Q. Mr. Boulton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1757.

Randles, Sir J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Naval Visits to the Colonies, Appreciation of, *Nov. 19*, 1396.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
Old-Age Pensions Act—Extension to Naval and Military Pensioners in Channel Islands, proposed, *Nov. 11*, 257.

Rates and Rating
Non-Payment of General Rate commitments for—Returns of Cases proposed.
Q. Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 23*, 1779.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10*, 172.
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 13*, 756, 768–771; *Nov. 18*, 1283–1285, 1335–1338; *Nov. 19*, 1503, 1519.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11*, 324, 340–342, 347, 364–367; *Nov. 12*, 596–600.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Constabulary—Legislative proposals, *Nov. 11*, 289, 290.
Education—Government proposals for effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1434.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10*, 85–87, 94.
Home Rule—Identity of Irish American visitors, *Nov. 16*, 871, 872.

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
Irish Land Bill, *Intro., Nov. 23*, 1834–1846.
Proposals for Passing into Law this Session, *Nov. 23*, 1844, 1845.
Land Purchase Transactions to date, *Nov. 11*, 294.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Australasia—Naval Defence proposals' *Nov. 16*, 861.
Clare Evicted Tenants, Position of, *Nov. 12*, 557.
Doolin—Disturbance on 18th ult., *Nov. 16*, 887.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Com., Nov. 10*, 75–81.
Forestry—Landlords' powers to cut down Timber, *Nov. 19*, 1411, 1412.
House of Commons—Press Accommodation, *Nov. 11*, 298, 299; *Nov. 16*, 879.
Land Purchase
Advances, Information as to, *Nov. 10*, 52.
Transactions to date, *Nov. 16*, 883, 884.
O'Callaghan-Westropp Estate, Position of Evicted Tenants, *Nov. 16*, 888.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
Army Horses purchased in Wales, *Nov. 10*, 34.
Ceylon South Indian Labour Agency, Subsidy to, *Nov. 17*, 1033.
Crown Colonies with Government Workshops undertaking private business, *Nov. 17*, 1034.
India
Administration—Reform proposals, *Nov. 12*, 527, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Bombay Education Standard—Government Resolution, *Nov. 2*, 525, 526.
Midnapur Case, *Nov. 19*, 1393, 1394.
Nundo Lal Bannerjee, Assassination of, *Nov. 16*, 846.
Prisoners—Operation of Amnesty, *Nov. 12*, 528.
Sedition, Proposals for Dealing with, *Nov. 19*, 1395.
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 13*, 753, 754, 757; *Nov. 17*, 1143–1145; *Nov. 18*, 1259–1263.
Naval Torpedo-Boat Destroyers—Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1028.
Railway Combines
Effect on Position of Small Shareholder, *Nov. 17*, 1043.
Powers of Board of Trade, *Nov. 11*, 275.
Trinidad Medical Department Administration, *Nov. 11*, 266.

Regent's Park
Lake, Cleansing of.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 12*, 520.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
Land Transfer Acts, Scope of Royal Commission, *Nov. 11*, 251.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1142.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 339.

Renton, Maj. L. [Lincolnshire, Gainsborough]
Army Reservists Residing Abroad, Statistics as to, *Nov. 19*, 1381.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne.]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 626–630, 653–657, 669.

Revenue and Expenditure
Capital Expenditure, Amounts Issued to Meet.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1760.

Reynell Estate
Memorial from Tenants.
Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 847.

Rhodesia
Native Labour Bureau, Proceedings of.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 23*, 1773.
Poll-Tax System.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 23*, 1772.
Trial by Jury—Amendment of Law.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 19*, 1398.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
Customs Abstractor Clerks, Pensions of, *Nov. 19*, 1372; *Nov. 23*, 1792.
Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners, Old-Age Pensions Paid by, *Nov. 17*, 1061.
Middlesex Sessions—Case of A. Jones, *Nov. 17*, 1039.
Northallerton Quarter Sessions—Flogging Administered to Incorrigible Rogue, *Nov. 17*, 1039.
Post Office—Hours of Duty in Certain Provincial Offices, *Nov. 11*, 248; *Nov. 12*, 546.
Superannuation—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
War Office Boot Contracts, *Nov. 12*, 516.

Richardson, Mr. A. [Nottingham, S.]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 778; *Nov. 17*, 1168.
Nottingham—Delay in Railway Delivery North of York, *Nov. 13*, 725, 726.

Rifle Clubs
Ammunition Supply.
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 19*, 1381.
Qs. Mr. Courthope, Earl Winterton, Mr. H. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 18*, 1211.

Riverstown
Boycotting in District.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 18*, 1224.
Condition of District.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1413.
Disturbance—Inquiry, proposed.
Q. Mr. James O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 32.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Belloc, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1414.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1424.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Belloc, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 23*, 1796.
Postmaster, Allegations against.
Q. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 18*, 1231.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 23*, 1801.

Roads
Government Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1430.
Tar Macadam, Cost of, etc.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1048.

Roberts, Earl
Army
Organisation of, as a Means of Defence, *Nov. 23*, 1679.
Territorial Force, Value as a Fighting Force, *Nov. 23*, 1681, 1682, 1692, 1693.
Defence of the Empire
Adequacy of present System, *Nov. 23*, 1679–1696.
Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1679, 1683–1691, 1696, 1741.

Roberts, Mr. C. [Lincoln]
German Duty on Alcoholic Liquors, *Nov. 11*, 268.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 748–750; *Nov. 16*, 912–919, 921, 929; *Nov. 18*, 1322–1326, 1327.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
Crockham Hill Farm, Price of, *Nov. 12*, 512.
Croydon Distress Committee, Grant for, *Nov. 19*, 1369.
Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *Nov. 12*, 508.

[*cont.*

Roberts, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*

Emigration—Expenditure on Assisted Passages, *Nov. 10*, 43.

Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 18*, 1278–1280.

Unemployment Circular of Local Government Board, *Nov. 12*, 540.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]

Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 13*, 779–781, 798; *Nov. 16*, 996–1000, 1003.

Roberts, Sir J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]

Indian Liquor Trade—Method of Ascertaining Local Opinion, *Nov. 17*, 1032.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]

Egypt

Administration Reform Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1038.

Committee of Public Safety for, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1037, 1038.

Robertson, Sir G. S. [Bradford, Central]

Forth and Clyde Canal Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1767.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*Attorney-General* [South Shields]

Hooley, E. T.—Financial Transactions in Wife's Name, alleged, *Nov. 18*, 1223, 1224.

Land Transfer Acts, Scope of Royal Commission, *Nov. 11*, 251.

Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11*, 445; *Nov. 12*, 696.

Roch, Mr. W. [Galway, E.]

Horse-breeding—Grant from Imperial Funds, *Nov. 23*, 1790.

Welsh Single-School Areas, Scholars in, *Nov. 19*, 1374; *Nov. 23*, 1787.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]

Cork Land Purchase Prices, etc., *Nov. 23*, 1798.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wiltshire, Devizes]

Old-Age Pension for Wife of Man receiving Poor Relief, *Nov. 17*, 1047; *Nov. 19*, 1378.

Wiltshire—Small Holdings on War Office Land, *Nov. 16*, 865, 866.

Ronaldshay, Lord [Middlesex, Hornsey]

Admiralty Timber Contracts—Method of Calling for Tenders, *Nov. 12*, 507.

Belgian Colonial Minister, Identity of, *Nov. 10*, 38.

China—Fa-ku-men Railway, Withdrawal of Japanese Protest against, *Nov. 10*, 41.

Congo Free State — British Consular Reports, *Nov. 10*, 38.

Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10*, 194-197.

Estate Duty Office Staff, Grievances of, *Nov. 10*, 46.

Rooskey

Magistrates in District.

Q. Mr. James O'Kelley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 31.

Roscrea

Labourers' Cottages Scheme.

Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 19*, 1383.

Ross

Postal Facilities.

Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 11*, 249.

Rosyth Naval Base

See under Navy.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]

Bastardy Laws, Amendment proposed, *Nov. 19*, 1369.

Business of the House, Course of, *Nov. 19*, 1436.

Dorsetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1405.

Gooseberry Mildew—Removal of Affected Bushes, *Nov. 19*, 1406.

Hop Industry—Legislative Proposals, *Nov. 10*, 29.

Kent Small Holdings

Applications, *Nov. 12*, 508.

Land available for, *Nov. 23*, 1793.

Parliament — Approach by the Embankment, *Nov. 23*, 1780.

Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 11*, 355–357, 381–385.

Small Holdings and Allotments Act, Expenditure under, *Nov. 23*, 1791.

Runciman, Rt. Hon. W.—*President of the Board of Education* [Dewsbury]

Education (Provision of Meals) Act

Levy of Rate—Cases sanctioned, *Nov. 20*, 1575.

Section 3, Applications under, *Nov. 19*, 1373.

Government Proposals for effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1375.

Inspectors' Reports, Discontinuance of, *Nov. 13*, 714.

Limpsfield School Accommodation, *Nov. 17*, 1025.

Motor Warning Signs—Issue to Schools, *Nov. 16*, 879.

Welsh School and Attendance Statistics, *Nov. 19*, 1374; *Nov. 23*, 1787.

Women Inspectors employed by the Board, *Nov. 11*, 249.

Runcorn

Vaccination of Mr. Johnson's Child.

Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12*, 507; *Nov. 19*, 1371.

Russell, Earl
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 491–493, 495.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*Vice-President, Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
Black Scab Outbreak, Measures for dealing with, *Nov. 16*, 882; *Nov. 19*, 1412.
Butter
Creamery, Definition of, *Nov. 11*, 284.
Irish Surprise Competitions, Entries for, *Nov. 11*, 285.
Carroll, Mr., Qualifications of, *Nov. 19*, 1367.
Cattle and Horse-Breeding Schemes in Ireland, Assistance to, *Nov. 17*, 1062, 1063.
Forestry
Afforestation Proposals, *Nov. 11*, 284.
Landlords' Powers to cut down Timber, *Nov. 19*, 1412.

Russia
British Subjects visiting—Case of Mr. J. Edelstein.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 17*, 1036.
Lumber Industry—Report Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1678.
Luxenburg Case.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 19*, 1400.

Russo-Japanese War
British Shipping Claims.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *Nov. 17*, 1038.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Education
Number of Scholars on Registers, *Nov. 11*, 281.
School Building Grants
Amount Allotted, *Nov. 10*, 45.
Statutory System of Distribution, *Nov. 18*, 1215, 1216.
German Duty on Alcoholic Liquors, *Nov. 11*, 268.
Indian Prisoners—Operation of Amnesty, *Nov. 12*, 528.
Persia—Recall of British and Russian Subjects in Persian Service, proposed, *Nov. 10*, 41.
Twickenham, Cost of Living in, *Nov. 11*, 248.

Rutherford, Mr. W. H. [Liverpool, West Derby]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1164–1168; *Nov. 18*, 1315–1322, 1324; *Nov. 19*, 1499, 1502, 1506–1509.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 342–345, 378–381, 440, 448, 449.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Army Territorial Force Permanent Staff—Re-posting to Regiments, *Nov. 16*, 817.
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 464, 494.
Invasion, Possibility of, and Precautions against, *Nov. 23*, 1741.
Moray Firth—British Trawlers prohibited in Territorial Waters, *Nov. 11*, 243.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts
Report Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 839.

Salter, Mr. A. C. [Hampshire, N.]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 759–762; *Nov. 16*, 979–981; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1594–1607.

Saltoun, Lord
Moray Firth—Operation of Trawling Byelaws, *Nov. 11*, 240.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Licensing Act, 1904—New Licences granted, *Nov. 12*, 535.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 751; *Nov. 16*, 934–943, 998; *Nov. 17*, 1077, 1100, 1110, 1111; *Nov. 18*, 1239, 1268, 1271–1276, 1311; *Nov. 19*, 1443, 1460, 1497, 1512, 1513; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1653–1656.
Liquor Traffic—Licensing Statistics (1900–8), *Nov. 12*, 535.
Police Royal Commission—Evidence by G. Reed, *Nov. 12*, 534.

Saye and Sele, Lord
Army
Recruits, Character and Quality of, *Nov. 16*, 829.
Territorial Force Permanent Staff—Re-posting to Regiments, *Nov. 16*, 817.

Schwann, Sir C. E. [Manchester, N.]
British Indians in Natal—Education of Indian Children, *Nov. 16*, 869.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
British Indians in Natal—Armitage Case, *Nov. 19*, 1397.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 778.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Copyright—International Conference Report, *Nov. 16*, 852.
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 357; *Nov. 12*, 665, 687–689, 691, 711.
Westminster Improvement Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1784.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.

Secretary of State for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancs., S.W., Newton]
Telephone Service Employees, Qualifications of, *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Seely, Colonel — *Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Africa, West
  - Brass
    - Export and Import Statistics, *Nov. 11*, 265.
    - Specie Imports (1906–1907), *Nov. 11*, 265.
    - Spirit Imports in 1907, *Nov. 11*, 263.
- Agriculture Tropical Bureau, Establishment of, *Nov. 10*, 37.
- British Indians in Natal
  - Armitage Case, *Nov. 19*, 1397.
  - Education of Indian Children, *Nov. 16*, 869.
- Cape Colony Stamp and Licences Act, Provisions of, *Nov. 12*, 517.
- Ceylon
  - Colombo
    - Government Workshops and Private Work, *Nov. 17*, 1036.
    - Graving Dock
      - Ship Repairs by the Government, *Nov. 10*, 37.
      - Workshops, Contract for, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
    - Wesley College Estimates, *Nov. 17*, 1035.
  - Public Works System, *Nov. 10*, 37.
  - South Indian Labour Agency, Subsidy to, *Nov. 17*, 1033.
- Crown Colonies with Government Workshops undertaking Private Business, *Nov. 17*, 1034.
- Emigrants' Information Office, Grant to, *Nov. 19*, 1399.
- Gold Coast Colony—Railway Rates on Spirits, *Nov. 11*, 264.

Seely, Colonel—*cont.*
- Natal
  - Native Affairs—Provisions of Bill, *Nov. 12*, 530.
  - Natives, Flogging of—Miss Colenso's Letter, *Nov. 19*, 1397.
- Naval Visits—Appreciation by the Colonies, *Nov. 19*, 1396.
- Niger Delta—Payment of Fines and Currency used, *Nov. 11*, 264, 265.
- Nigeria
  - Liquor Traffic Inquiry, *Nov. 11*, 266.
  - Southern
    - Spirit Importation, *Nov. 19*, 1398.
  - Spirit Imports, Value of, *Nov. 17*, 1034.
- Opium
  - Hong-Kong, Proposals as to, *Nov. 19*, 1398.
  - Straits Settlements Commission Report, *Nov. 19*, 1398.
- Orange River Colony
  - Civil Service—British-born Persons reduced in *Status*, *Nov. 16*, 868, 869.
  - Loan, Guarantee of, *Nov. 17*, 1036.
- Pacific Phosphate Company, Report on Allegations against, *Nov. 12*, 531.
- Rhodesia
  - Native Labour Bureau, *Nov. 23*, 1773, 1774.
  - Poll-tax System, *Nov. 23*, 1773.
  - Trial by Jury—Amendment of Law, *Nov. 19*, 1399.
- Transvaal
  - Civil Service
    - Appointments, Returns as to, *Nov. 12*, 529.
    - British-born Persons reduced in *Status*, *Nov. 16*, 868, 869.
    - Command Paper 4353, *Nov. 23*, 1771, 1772.
  - Mine Labour — Circulation of Minute, *Nov. 16*, 869.
  - Natives—Eviction under a Law of 1895, *Nov. 17*, 1034.
- Trinidad
  - Governor, Appointment of, *Nov. 11*, 250.
  - Medical Department Administration, *Nov. 11*, 266.
- Tropical Diseases — Action taken on Colonial Governors' Reports, *Nov. 11*, 267.

Serpentine
Cleansing of, proposed.
Qs. Mr. B. S. Straus; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *Nov. 16*, 879.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 171.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Cromarty Fishermen, Procedure in Prosecuting, *Nov. 18*, 1199.
- Edinburgh Coopers, Charge against, *Nov. 12*, 512.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con. Nov. 10*, 138–142, 169, 182, 191.
- Pilots—Clyde Pilot Case, *Nov. 12*, 547, 548.
- Truck Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *Nov. 18*, 1202.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.]
- Agriculture Department—Qualifications of Mr. Carroll, *Nov. 19*, 1367.
- Ballyvourney—Case of W. Sheehan, *Nov. 18*, 1225.
- Butter
  - Creamery, Definition of, *Nov. 11*, 284.
  - Irish Surprise Competitions, Entries for, *Nov. 11*, 285.
- Charleville Labourers' Cottages Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1226.
- Colthurst Estate
  - Case of J. Creedon, *Nov. 19*, 1423.
  - Sale Proposals, *Nov. 17*, 1065, 1066.
- Cork Evicted Tenants — Land available for Reinstatements, *Nov. 10*, 52.
- Fitzpatrick Estate — Case of Mr. J. McSweeny, *Nov. 19*, 1429.
- Fuge Estate—Sale of Templemary Portion, *Nov. 10*, 53.
- Galway Land Purchase Statistics, *Nov. 23*, 1799.
- Land (Ireland) Acts—Claims of excluded Tenants, *Nov. 11*, 291.
- Land Purchase—Distribution of untenanted Land, *Nov. 10*, 55.
- Millstreet — Cottage occupied by D. O'Connor, *Nov. 13*, 726.
- O'Leary Estate — Cases of B. Mayneham, P. Colter, and J. J. Riordan, *Nov. 19*, 1423.
- Old-Age Pensions — Residence of Husband abroad, *Nov. 18*, 1200.
- Toames, Purchase of, *Nov. 17*, 1027.

Sherlock Estate
- Inspection of evicted Tenants' late Holding.
  Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 558.

Sherwell, Mr. A. J. [Huddersfield]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 771–774.

Shop Hours Act
- Orders under, Presented, *Nov. 16*, 809, 838, ; *Nov. 20*, 1570 ; *Nov. 23*, 1679.

Shropshire
- Small Holdings Scheme.
  Q. Mr. J. Collings ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1409.

Sierra Leone
- Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1186, 1198.

Simon, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Walthamstow]
- Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 944–946 ; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1615–1624.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
- Bell Rock, Trawling near, *Nov. 13*, 714.
- Cathcart School Site, Area and Cost of, *Nov. 16*, 851 ; *Nov. 23*, 1756.
- Edinburgh—Dispute between Town Council and Distress Committee, *Nov. 11*, 282, 283.
- Education
  - Fund, Distribution of, *Nov. 19*, 1376.
  - School Attendance Grant, *Nov. 16*, 851, 881.
  - Travelling Expenses of Departmental Officials, *Nov. 20*, 1576.
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 71–75, 93–95, 107, 110, 117, 125, 127, 128, 151, 152, 155–157, 160, 168, 178, 180, 185, 186 ; *Nov. 10*, 189, 193, 208–210, 211, 212.
  - Electors Enfranchised under, *Nov. 16*, 846.
- Fisheries—Scottish New Cruiser, *Nov. 10*, 51.
- Food and Drugs Act, Administration of, *Nov. 23*, 1795.
- Greenock—Admiralty Purchase of Portion of Estate and Valuation of Remainder, *Nov. 12*, 501.
- Herring, Close Time for, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1026.
- Lanarkshire Education Grant, *Nov. 19*, 1376.
- Motor Speed Limitation—Local Authorities' Powers, *Nov. 17*, 1061.
- Poor Law
  - Aged Persons in Receipt of Relief, *Nov. 11*, 283.
  - Relief Statistics, *Nov. 16*, 882.

Sleeping Sickness
- Agreement, etc., with Germany, Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009, 1017.

Sligo
- United Irish League Branches.
  Qs. Mr. C. Craig ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 12*, 552.

Sloan Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Education—Fee for Teaching Mathematics, *Nov. 23*, 1763.
Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief Disqualification, *Nov. 23*, 1764.
Poor Law—Irish Commission Report, *Nov. 23*, 1763.

Small Holdings
[*See also Names of Counties and Places.*]
Applications received.
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1206.
Qs. Mr. R. Harcourt, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1217, 1218.
Co-operative Societies formed.
Qs. Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1409.
Demand for, Method of Ascertaining.
Qs. Mr. Crooks, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1220.
Dismissal of Applicants by Employers, Cases of.
Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 11*, 297.
Expenditure under Act.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 23*, 1791.
Expenses, Definition of.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1222.
Houses and Buildings, Schemes for.
Qs. Mr. R. Harcourt, Mr. Bennett; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1217.
Information as to.
Q. Capt. Clive; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17*, 1052.
Register of Applications proposed.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1218.
Qs. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1222.
Rejection, Procedure in Appealing against.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1220.
Reports on Applications.
Qs. Mr. Bennett, Earl Winterton, Mr. Morrell, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 18*, 1221.
Transactions to Date.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 13*, 714.

Small Holdings Act, 1892
Amendment Bill, Facilities for.
Qs. Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 560.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
Indian Army—Pension System, *Nov. 16*, 868.
Old-Age Pension Officers, Supervision of *Nov. 19*, 1378.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 16*, 942–944, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1623–1633.

Smythe Estate
Hopkins, F., Case of.
Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 889.
Riggs, Mrs., Case of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1064.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
Customs Superintendents
Classification of, *Nov. 17*, 1059.
Promotion of, *Nov. 23*, 1749.
Old-Age Pensions
Board paid by Son or Daughter to aged Parent, Reckoning of, *Nov. 17*, 1056.
Delay, proposals for obviating, *Nov. 17*, 1058, 1059.
Officers, work of—Case of H. Mortished, *Nov. 11*, 268, 269.
Superannuation, Legislative proposals as to, *Nov. 17*, 1060.

Solicitor-General
Sir S. T. Evans.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

Somaliland
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1186, 1198.

Soudan
Tilul Basran Tribes, Operations against.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 18*, 1201.

South African War
Case of A. A. Reynolds.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 10*, 35.
History of—Pay of Officers employed.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1759.

Southwark, Bishop of
Children Bill, *Rep., Nov. 12*, 488.

Speaker
Committee, Procedure in setting up, *Nov. 11*, 289, 290.
Count could not be taken during the Dinner Hour, *Nov. 17*, 1142.
Education (Scotland) Bill—Rulings, *Nov. 10*, 109, 110, 125.

[*cont.*

Speaker—*cont.*
- House of Commons
  - Galleries, Re-opening of, *Nov. 11*, 298.
  - Press Accommodation, *Nov. 11*, 298.
- Irish Home Rule—Identity of American Visitors, *Nov. 16*, 871, 872.
- Licensing Bill
  - Adjournment of Debate—Motion refused, *Nov. 17*, 1143.
  - Irrelevant matter, *Nov. 11*, 315.
  - Irrelevant Observations, *Nov. 18*, 1315.
  - Monopoly Value, Definition of, *Nov. 19*, 1438.
  - Personal remarks were out of order, *Nov. 17*, 1144.
- Matter of urgency, Definition of, *Nov. 12*, 559.
- "Murdered" — Use of Expression by Member, *Nov. 23*, 1797.
- Questions, *see that title.*

Spicer, Sir A. [Hackney, Central]
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 350, 419; *Nov. 12*, 630–634, 690, 709.

Staffordshire
- Small Holdings Applications.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1223.

Stanier, Mr. [Shropshire, Newport]
- Agriculture Boards in Great Britain and Ireland—Co-operation in dealing with Diseases, *Nov. 23*, 1794.
- Black Scab
  - Checking of outbreaks, *Nov. 19*, 1408; *Nov. 23*, 1794.
  - Irish outbreak, *Nov. 19*, 1412.
- Foot-and-Mouth Disease—American outbreak, *Nov. 23*, 1793, 1794.
- Wellington (Salop)—Cause of Death of Mr. Parton's Horses, *Nov. 19*, 1407.
- Wirral—Outbreak of Contagious Mammitis, *Nov. 19*, 1407.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
- Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 475–479, 482.

Statute Law Revision Bill
- Report from Joint Committee, *Nov. 12*, 457, 563.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. (Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
- Navy
  - Dockyards—Foreign Workmen Employed, *Nov. 12*, 523.
  - "Hindustan," Information as to, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
  - Home Fleet—Crews of Ships, *Nov. 12*, 523.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, Central]
- Government Contracts and Fair Wage Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, *Nov. 16*, 880.
- Naval Shipbuilding Programme—Allocation of Contracts, *Nov. 16*, 858.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 335–337, 404, 410–412; *Nov. 12*, 591, 612–619.
- Post Office, Eastern Central District—Overtime of Sorters and Letter-Carriers *Nov. 16*, 877.

Stewart, Mr. H. [Greeenock]
- Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 90.

Stipendiary Curates
- *See under* Church of England.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somersetshire, E.]
- Black Scab
  - English and Scottish areas affected, *Nov. 20*, 1573.
  - Measures for preventing spread of, *Nov. 12*, 510; *Nov. 19*, 1405, 1406, 1408; *Nov. 23*, 1794.
- Crockham Hill Farm, Price of, *Nov. 12*, 512.
- Derbyshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1385.
- Diseases, Co-operation between Agriculture Boards in dealing with, *Nov. 23*, 1795.
- Dorsetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1403–1405.
- Durham Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 17*, 1051.
- Edenbridge—Case of D. Nicholls, *Nov. 12*, 509.
- Foot-and-Mouth Disease—American Outbreak, *Nov. 19*, 1411; *Nov. 23*, 1755, 1793, 1794.
- Gloucestershire Small Holdings, *Nov. 12*, 547; *Nov. 19*, 1410.
- Gooseberry Mildew
  - Measures for dealing with, *Nov. 12*, 511.
  - Removal of Affected Bushes, *Nov. 19*, 1406.
- Hop Industry—Production Statistics, *Nov. 11*, 255.
- Kent Small Holdings
  - Applications, *Nov. 12*, 508.
  - Land Available for, *Nov. 23*, 1793.
- Milk Analysis by London County Council, *Nov. 19*, 1408.
- Nottinghamshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 23*, 1748.
- Ordnance Survey
  - Maps — Placing Copies in County Towns, proposed, *Nov. 17*, 1052.
  - Private Work by Officials, *Nov. 10*, 26.

[*cont.*

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Armaments, Limitation of Expenditure on, *July 25*, 690.
- Beer
  - Brewing Statistics (1820–1907), *July 30*, 1732.
  - Use of Malt Substitutes, *July 29*, 1469.
- Bisley Camp Hawkers' Licences, *July 29*, 1468.
- Civil Service Estimates, Supplementary Amount Included, *July 23*, 334; *July 31*, 1961.
- Coinage and Currency—Exhibition of certain Specimens, *July 30*, 1733.
- Customs and Excise
  - Amalgamation Scheme, *July 23*, 321.
  - Excise Officers' Salaries, *July 31*, 1960.
  - Stock Taking System, *July 30*, 1738.
- Death Duties—Receipts in 1908, *July 23*, 334.
- Finance Bill, 3R. *July 25*, 680–693.
  - Procedure with Regard to Discussion, *July 25*, 680.
- Hop Industry
  - Committee Report and Recommendations, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 31*, 2045–2050.
  - Legislative Proposals, *July 27*, 855.
- Income-Tax
  - Earned Income, Definition of, *July 23*, 320.
  - Reduction Claims, Date for Making, *July 28*, 1198.
  - Royalties on Patents, *July 27*, 847.
  - Scottish Contribution (1906–8), *July 23*, 336.
- Inland Revenue Chemical Officers, Petition of, *July 30*, 1733.
  - Returns, etc., Required by, *July 23*, 320.
- Land Purchase Stock
  - Applications for New Issue, *July 27*, 829.
  - Suggestions for Future Issues, *July 29*, 1510.
- Lewis, Island of—Rating *Impasse*, *July 29*, 1486.
- Liquor Traffic
  - Hotel Licences Granted in Scotland, *July 27*, 848.
  - Six-Day Licences in Scotland, *July 23*, 319.
- National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v.* Read, *July 29*, 1509, 1510.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Aliens in East of London, Work Entailed by, *July 28*, 1186.
  - Cost of, *July 23*, 335.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
- Old-Age Pensions—*cont.*
  - Funds, Provision of, *July 25*, 681–684.
  - Medical Relief of Pensioner, *July 27*, 829.
  - Rural Pensioners, Estimate of, *July 23*, 319.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 31*, 1971–1976, 1980, 1983–1989, 1991, 1994–1999.
  - Charitable Annuities, *Aug. 1*, 2086.
  - Excise Officers' Salaries, *July 31*, 1960.
  - Regulations, Issue of, *July 30*, 1762.
  - Workhouses, Position of Pensioners in, *July 30*, 1733.
- Revenue and Expenditure
  - Additional Expenditure, Proposals for Meeting, *July 25*, 681–685.
  - Statistics for 1907–8, *July 27*, 848.
  - Welsh Purposes, Expenditure on, *July* on, *July 22*, 89.
- Spirits—Duties Paid in 1907–8, *July 29*, 1468.
- Sugar Duty, Reduction of, *July 25*, 685.
- Taxation—Necessity for Providing New Sources, *July 25*, 690–692.
- Trade, State of, in Great Britain and the United States, *July 25*, 686–689.
- Unemployment Grant, Proposals for, *July 22*, 89; *July 23*, 319.
- Walsall Excise Offences—Fines (1898–1907), *July 29*, 1485, 1486.
- War Office Accounting Officer, Name of, *July 31*, 1960.

Local Authorities
- Scottish Deputation Expenses—Return Ordered, *July 30*, 1693.

Local Authorities (Education) Bill
- Starring by the Government, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Collings, *July 31*, 2024; Mr. Asquith, 2024.

Local Government Board
- *President*—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. C. F. G. Masterman
- Loans to Municipalities, Conditions Attached to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 29*. 1555–1557; Mr. Burns, 1565–1567.
- Sinking Funds on Public Buildings—Period of Repayment.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 29*, 1558, 1559; Mr. Burns, 1566.
- Vote, Circumstances of Passing.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 29*, 1575.

[*cont.*

Superannuation Act, 1859
- Section 7—Financial Limits on Treasury Powers.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 23*, 1789.

Surrey
- Small Holdings Applications.
  - *Q.* Mr. Marnham; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1220.

Sussex
- Small Holdings Applications.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Beaumont, Earl Winterton; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 18*, 1219.

Swineshead
- Tenant given Notice for Agitation in Connection with Small Holdings, Alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitbread; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17*, 1021.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
- Education Bill, Proposals as to, *Nov. 23*, 1805.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
- Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1580.

"Taunton"
- Charge against Crew.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11*, 272.

"Taurus" Steam Trawler
- Arrest by German Gunboat.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Doughty; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 12*, 532.

Taxation
- Local Returns (England and Wales) Presented, *Nov. 23*, 1744.
- Statistics for Great Britain and Certain Foreign Countries.
  - *Q.* Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 10*, 26.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe]
- Opium
  - Hong-Kong, Proposals as to, *Nov. 19*, 1398.
  - International Commission, Proposals for, *Nov. 19*, 1401.
  - Straits Settlements Commission Report, *Nov. 19*, 1398.

Telephone Service
- Coast Communication, Value of.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Doughty; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Nov. 11*, 259.
- Employees, Qualifications of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Seddon; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 19*, 1364.

Telephone Service—*cont.*
- National Telephone Company
  - Employees, Position of.
    - *Qs.* Sir W. Holland, Sir W. J. Collins; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 545.
  - Materials Used in Laying New Lines.
    - *Q.* Mr. Curran; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 546.

Templemore
- Bomb Outrage at Mr. O'Mullane's House.
  - *Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 11*, 294.

Territorial Force
- *See under* Army.

Thames Embankment
- Motor Traffic, Regulation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boulton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 19*, 1372.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 23*, 1803.
- Education — Government Proposals for Effecting Settlement, *Nov. 19*, 1374, 1375.

Thomastown Estate
- Untenanted Land, Acquisition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1068.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
- Customs and Excise—Overtime in Statistical Department, *Nov. 17*, 1054.
- House of Commons Galleries, Re-opening of, *Nov. 11*, 298.
- Naval Dockyards—Conditions of Employing Extra Men, *Nov. 18*, 1211.
- Police, Royal Commission—Evidence by G. Reed, *Nov. 12*, 534.
- Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 385-387.
- Post Office.
  - Eastern Central District Auxiliar Postmen, *Nov. 16*, 877.
  - Split Duties, Effect of Abolition of, *Nov. 12*, 542.
- Unemployment Circular of Local Government Board, *Nov. 12*, 539.
- West Ham Distress Committee, Grant to, *Nov. 12*, 541.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
- Estate Duty Office Staff, Grievances of, *Nov. 10*, 45, 46.

Toames
- Purchase of.
  - Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 17*, 1027.

Tobacco
Scottish Cultivation, Encouragement of.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 17*, 1055.

Tobago
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1186, 1198.

Towerhill
Cattle-Drive on 7th inst.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 18*, 1225.

Trade, Board of
President.—Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill
Parliamentary Secretary—Sir H. E Kearley.

Trade Records
Report—Translation of German Customs Union Rules.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 16*, 841.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *Nov. 10*, 2; *Nov. 11*, 213, 247; *Nov. 17*, 1009, 1016; *Nov. 23*, 1678, 1745.
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009, 1017; *Nov. 23*, 1678, 1745.

Transvaal
Civil Service.
Appointments, Returns as to.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Col. Seely, *Nov. 12*, 528.
British-born Persons Reduced in Status.
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Col. Seely, *Nov. 16*, 868.
Command Paper 4353, Information given in.
Qs. Mr. Carlile, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Col. Seely, *Nov. 23*, 1771.
Malagasy Labour for Mines, *see* Madagascar.
Mine Labour—Circulation of Minute.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Col. Seely, *Nov. 16*, 869.
Natives—Eviction under a Law of 1895.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Col. Seely, *Nov. 17*, 1033.

Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill.
Date of taking.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 19*, 1429.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.
Financial Secretary—Mr. C. E. Hobhouse.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education* [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Education (Provision of Meals) Act—Adoption by Local Authorities, *Nov. 17*, 1049.
Elementary Education (England and Wales) Bill—Effect on Schedule II., Clause 39, of Code, *Nov. 11*, 281.
Grants
Conditions of Granting, *Nov. 18*, 1216.
School Building Grant — Amount Allotted, *Nov. 10*, 45.
Statutory System of Distribution, *Nov. 18*, 1216.
Inspectors' Reports, *Nov. 17*, 1049.
Number of Scholars on Registers, *Nov. 11*, 281.

Trinidad
Annual Report Presented, *Nov. 18*, 1186, 1198.
Governor, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 250.
Medical Department Administration.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Rees; *As.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 266.

Tropical Diseases
Colonial Governors' Reports, Action taken on.
Q. Sir J. Brunner; *A.* Colonel Seely, *Nov. 11*, 266.

Truck Committee
Report, Date of presenting.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Nov. 18*, 1202.

Tuberculosis
Milch Cows and Tuberculin Test.
Qs. Mr. E. Davies, Captain Craig; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 17*, 1050.

Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill
Abandonment of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 10*, 33.
Scope of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 17*, 1069.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 23*, 1752.

Tuke, Sir J. [Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities]
Feeble-minded Persons—Cost of Royal Commission, *Nov. 16*, 879.

Tullaroan
Disturbance on 10th inst.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1427.

Twickenham
  Cost of Living in.
    Q. Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 11*, 248.

Unemployment
  Afforestation Schemes carried out.
    Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 875.
    Leeds Scheme, *see under* Leeds.
  Dillon, Case of.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1023.
  Distress Committees
    Applications refused.
      Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 18*, 1203.
    Circulation of List.
      Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 873.
    Number appointed.
      Qs. Mr. Mond; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 873.
  Grant
    Administration of.
      Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 23*, 1776.
    Amount unexpended.
      Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
    Conditions of making Payments from.
      Q. Mr. Beaumont; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1024.
    Supplementary Grants, System of applying.
      Qs. Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Nov. 11*, 270.
  Grouping of Districts, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Curran; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 13*, 713.
  Percentage of Work done.
    Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 11*, 277.
  Poor Relief—Discrepancy between Statement of Prime Minister and Local Government Board Order.
      Qs. Mr. A. Henderson, *Nov. 12*, 640–644; Mr. Asquith, 643.
      Qs. Mr. Thorne, Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. G. Roberts, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Burns, Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 12*, 539.
    Adjournment of the House—Motion (*Mr. A. Henderson*), *Nov. 12*, 564, 640.
  Record of Cases, Form of.
    Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 18*, 1206.
  Register of Applicants, Form of.
    Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1046.

Unemployment—*cont.*
  Regulations, Supplemental, etc., Presented, *Nov. 17*, 1009, 1018.
  Returns of Proceedings of Distress Committees.
    Q. Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 16*, 873.
  Special Committees set up.
    Q. Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 19*, 1371.
  Voluntary Committees, Grant to.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Nov. 11*, 296.

United States
  Bonded Goods—Provisions in Treaty of Washington.
    Q. Mr. Boulton; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Nov. 12*, 532.
  Bulletin—Articles on Wages and Food.
    Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 23*, 1781.

University College
  Grants—Report of Committee.
    Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 19*, 1385.

Venezuela
  British Subjects, Position of.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKinnon Wood, *Nov. 19*, 1402.
  Exports to Trinidad, Restrictions on.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKinnon Wood, *Nov. 11*, 267.

Ventnor
  Post Office—Grievance of Telegraph Clerk.
    Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Nov. 12*, 501.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
  Finance Act, Section 6, Effect of Refusal to Administer, *Nov. 10*, 27.
  Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 19*, 1526.
  Old-Age Pensions—Calculation of Means of Married Couples, *Nov. 16*, 874.
  Small Holdings Applications Received, *Nov. 18*, 1206.

Victoria and Albert Museum
  Arrangement—Report Presented, *Nov. 10*, 2.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
  Income-Tax—Liability of Employers Contributions towards Workpeople's Pensions, *Nov. 19*, 1380.
  Licensing Bill, 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1625.

Wade Estate
  Purchase Proposals.
    Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Nov. 16*, 889.

Wages
Census, Progress made with.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 13*, 725.

Wakefield, Bishop of
Children Bill, *Rep.*, *Nov. 12*, 471.

Walker, Col. W. H. [Lancashire, S.W., Widnes]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 13*, 790–792; *Nov. 18*, 1323; *Nov. 19*, 1503.

Wallis Estate
Case of T. J. O'Keefe.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Nov. 19*, 1424.

War Office
Secretary of State—Right Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Boot Contracts and Prices.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 12*, 516.
Q. Mr. Nicholls; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 12*, 517.
"Coach and Horses" Public-House, Sale of, *see under* Hilsea.
Foreign Firms, Articles Ordered from.
Q. Mr. H. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 841, 862.
Historical or Literary Department.
Q. Sir C. W. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 23*, 1769.
Nosebags—Patent Rights of Mr. J. Bielefeld.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 849.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Dorsetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1404, 1405.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 127.
Navy—Rosyth Contract Bonus, *Nov. 11*, 261.
Old-Age Pension Regulations, Arrangements for Tabling and Discussing, *Nov, 19*, 1564.
Portsmouth—Code of Working Rules for Navvies, *Nov. 11*, 261.

Warde, Col. C. E. [Kent, Medway]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 358–360.
Railway and Canal Commission, Applications for Sanction to Working Agreements, *Nov. 17*, 1044, 1045.

Wason, Rt. Hon. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Education (Scotland) Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 16*, 892.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Africa, East—Mombassa Mail Service by British India Company, *Nov. 12*, 542.
Old-Age Pensions—Poor Relief as a Disqualification, *Nov. 12*, 513.
Trawling in Prohibited Areas Prevention Bill, Date of taking, *Nov. 19*, 1429.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow College]
Canada
British Trade Correspondents, Appointment of, *Nov. 11*, 277.
Cattle — Committee Inquiring into Subject, *Nov. 10*, 42.
Clyde Pilot Case, *Nov. 18*, 1200.
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 10*, 157.
Electors Enfranchised under, *Nov. 16*, 845, 846.
Report and Third Reading Stages, Allocation of Time for, *Nov. 10*, 58.
Estate Duty, Scottish Payments—Effect of Gunning Case, *Nov. 10*, 47.
Forth and Clyde Canal Scheme, *Nov. 23*, 1767.
Meat—Scottish Inspection System, *Nov. 13*, 714.
Navy—Capacity of Rosyth Dock, *Nov. 11*, 262.
Territorial Force—Caretakers of Shooting Ranges in Scotland, *Nov. 19*, 1381.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyne]
Consols—Facilities for Small Investors, *Nov. 20*, 1570; *Nov. 23*, 1775, 1776.
French Rentes, Holders of, *Nov. 20*, 1570; *Nov. 23*, 1775, 1776.
National Debt—Assets of Definite Cash Value, *Nov. 20*, 1571.
Staffordshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1223.

Weekly Rest Day
Inquiry, Result of.
Qs. Mr. C. E. Price; *As.* Mr. McKinnon Wood, *Nov. 19*, 1401.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Cromarty Fishermen, Proceed re in Prosecuting, *Nov. 18*, 1199.
India—Boundary of Penrose Estate at Simla, *Nov. 23*, 1762.

Wellington (Salop)
Cause of Death of Mr. Parton's Horses.
Q. Mr. Stanier; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19*, 1407.

Wellington (Somerset)
Administration of Old-Age Pensions Act.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *Nov. 19*, 1377.

Wemyss, Earl of
Defence—Adequacy of Present System, *Nov. 23*, 1741, 1742.
Nurses Registration Bill, 3R., *Nov. 10*, 4, 16.

West Ham
Distress Committee, Grant to.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 12*, 541.

Westminster
Improvement Scheme.
Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23*, 1784.

Whitbread, Mr. S. H. [Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon]
Licensing Act 1904—Compensation Awarded since 1906, *Nov. 11*, 247.
Swineshead—Tenant given Notice for Agitation in Connection with Small Holdings, Alleged, *Nov. 17*, 1021.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Cathcart School Site, Area and Cost of, *Nov. 16*, 851; *Nov. 23*, 1756.
Greenock — Admiralty Purchase of Portion of Estate and Valuation of Remainder, *Nov. 12*, 501.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, S.]
Reynell Estate—Memorial from Tenants, *Nov. 16*, 847.
Smythe Estate—Case of F. Hopkins, *Nov. 16*, 889.
Wade Estate Purchase Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 889.

Whitechapel
Unemployed Men and Workhouse Accommodation.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 17*, 1023.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 337–339, 388–393.

Whittaker, Sir T. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley]
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 17*, 1150.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 12*, 690.
Post Office—Acceleration of City Morning Delivery, *Nov. 12*, 545.
Dundee—Suitability for Naval Base, *Nov. 19*, 1390.

Wilkie, Mr. A. [Dundee]
Education Fund, Distribution of, *Nov. 19*, 1375.
Naval Shipbuilding Programme, *Nov. 19*, 1389, 1390.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin and Nairn]
Port of London Bill, *Com.*, *Nov. 11*, 377, 441.

Wills, Mr. A. W. [Dorset, N.]
Dorsetshire Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 19*, 1403, 1404, 1405.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness]
Curragh Camp—Quarters for Army Service Corps, *Nov. 10*, 36.
Licensing Bill Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 318–320.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W. R., Holmfirth.]
Women's Suffrage, Signatures on Petitions in Favour of, *Nov. 10*, 51.

Wilson, Mr. J. H. [Middlesbrough]
"Zeeland," ss.—Crew Engaged at Antwerp, *Nov. 10*, 22.

Wilson, Mr. P. W. [St. Pancras, S.]
Women's Suffrage, Signatures on Petitions in Favour of, *Nov. 10*, 51.

Wiltshire
Small Holdings on War Office Land.
Qs. Mr. Rogers; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16*, 865.

Winterton, Earl [Sussex, Horsham]
Army
  Remount Department, Excess in, *Nov. 17*, 1031.
  Territorial Force, Reports on Horses Available for, *Nov, 17*, 1031.
Australasian Naval Defence Proposals, *Nov. 16*, 860.
Esquimault, Defence of, *Nov. 16*, 856, 857.
Home Rule—Identity of Irish American Visitors, *Nov. 16*, 871.
Licensing Bill, *Con.*, *Nov. 16*, 918, 920–923; *Nov. 18*, 1239–1244; *Nov. 19*, 1496, 1501, 1504–1506, 1512, 1515, 1533; 3R., *Nov. 20*, 1607–1615.
  Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11*, 315–317.
Motor Warning Signs—Issue to Schools, *Nov. 16*, 879.
Murders—Metropolitan Statistics (1903–8), *Nov. 16*, 839.
Rifle Clubs, Supply of Ammunition to, *Nov. 18*, 1212.
Small Holdings—Reports on Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1221.
Sussex Small Holdings Applications, *Nov. 18*, 1219.

Nov. 10—*Nov.* 23.

Wirral
Outbreak of Contagious Mammitis.
Qs. Mr. Stanier; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Nov. 19,* 1407.

Women's Suffrage Movement
Prison Treatment—Power of Home Secretary, etc.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 11,* 252.
Qs. Mr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Nov. 17,* 1040, 1041.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 18,* 1202.
Pankhurst, Mrs. and Miss, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Cooper, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Nov. 17,* 1041.
Signatures on Petitions in Favour of.
Q. Mr. P. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. H. J. Wilson, *Nov. 10,* 51.

Wood, Mr. T. McKinnon—*Under-Secretary of State for, Foreign Affairs* [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
"Agnes Donohoe"—Compensation Claim, *Nov. 19,* 1401.
Congo Free State, Belgian Annexation of—Date of Presenting Despatch, *Nov. 19,* 1400.
Egypt—Cairo Drainage Scheme, *Nov. 23,* 1774.
German Duty on Alcoholic Liquors, *Nov. 11,* 268.
Opium International Commission, Proposals for, *Nov. 19,* 1401.
Port of London Bill, *Com., Nov. 12,* 605, 606.
Russia—Luxenburg Case, *Nov. 19,* 1400.
Russo-Japanese War—British Shipping Claims, *Nov. 17,* 1038.
Venezuela
Exports to Trinidad, Restrictions on, *Nov. 11,* 267.
Position of British Subjects, *Nov. 19,* 1402.
Weekly Rest Day—Result of Inquiry, *Nov. 19,* 1402.

Woolwich
Tramway Improvement Scheme.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Nov. 16,* 848.

Worcester
Quarter Sessions—Fees of Shorthand Writers.
Q. Dr. Hazel; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Nov. 12,* 519.

Workhouses
Labour Test.
Qs. Mr. Alden, Mr. Brooke; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Nov. 23,* 1786.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10,* 120.
Licensing Bill—Subsection (2) of New Clause, Proposals as to, *Nov. 16,* 892.
Old-Age Pension Regulations, Arrangements for Tabling and Discussing, *Nov. 19,* 1566.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
Irish Land Bill, Intro., *Nov. 23,* 1813, 1814, 1815, 1819, 1830, 1846–1861, 1902.
Proposals for Passing into Law this Session, *Nov. 23,* 1846.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
Education (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Nov. 10,* 94, 210.
Licensing Bill, *Con., Nov. 13,* 756, 764–766; *Nov. 16,* 981, 984, 985, 987, 1004; *Nov. 17,* 1089, 1092, 1107, 1109, 1116, 1119, 1145–1151; *Nov. 18,* 1289, 1310–1313; *Nov. 19,* 1453, 1457–1463, 1477, 1478; 3R. *Nov. 20,* 1588, 1589.
Report Stage—Allocation of Time, *Nov. 11,* 317.
North British Railway Order Confirmation Bill, 2R. *Nov. 17,* 1183.

"Zeeland," s.s.
Crew Engaged at Antwerp.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Nov. 10,* 22.